

185

ISSUE

July 1979 13



# BIBLICAL STUDIES

## IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor: Rev. Professor E.A. Russell, 14, Cadogan Park,  
Belfast, BT9 6HG, N.Ireland

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best, Dept of NT.,  
The University, Glasgow. G12 8QQ, Scotland

Business Editor: Rev. A. Harold Graham, B.A., 24,  
Myrtlefield Park, Belfast, BT9 6NE, N.Ireland

### Editorial Advisory Panel:

Professor David W. Gooding, Queen's University, Belfast  
The Revd Dr David Hill, University of Sheffield.

The Revd Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational  
College, College Rd., Whalley Range, Manchester  
M16 8BP

The Revd Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological Col-  
lege, Belfast, BT7 1JT

The Revd J. Murphy - O'Connor, L'Ecole Biblique,  
Jerusalem.

The Revd James McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin, 6.

Professor Ernest W. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford.

The Revd Principal Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College,  
Belfast, BT9 5BY

Mr David Payne, Queen's University, Belfast.

Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin, 2.

-----

### Subscriptions, to be forwarded to the Business Editor

The Journal will appear at least three times per year.

The Price for 1980 will be:

Individuals: £5.25 sterling; £5.50 punt; 11.50 US  
dollars; 21DM.

Institutions: £6.25 sterling; £6.50 punt; 13.50 US  
dollars; 25DM.



## IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

### EDITORIAL ADVISORY PANEL

Professor David W. Gooding, Queen's University, Belfast.

The Revd Dr David Hill, University of Sheffield.

The Revd Principal R.J. McKelvey, Northern Congregational  
College, Manchester.

The Revd Professor J. Stanley McIvor, Union Theological  
College, Belfast.

The Revd J. Murphy- O'Connor, L'Ecole Biblique,  
Jerusalem.

The Revd James McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin.

Professor Ernest W. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford.

The Revd Principal Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College,  
Belfast.

Mr David F. Payne, Queen's University, Belfast.

Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin.

## **When Prophecy Failed**

*Reactions and responses to failure in the Old Testament prophetic traditions*

**Robert P Carroll**

This comprehensive study examines how later generations dealt with Old Testament prophecies which had not been fulfilled, and makes illuminating use of the modern psychological theory of 'cognitive dissonance'. £7.50

## **Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture**

**Brevard S Childs**

Argues that there is something basically wrong with contemporary study of the Bible and calls for a fundamental re-thinking of the relationship between historical criticism and the theological use of the Bible as religious literature. £15.00

## **An Analytical Concordance to the RSV**

**Clinton Morrison**

Enormous sums of money and decades of scholarship have gone into the making of this, the first concordance to the RSV New Testament. As well as being the best and fullest concordance now available, usable by virtually any literate person seriously interested in Bible study, it is also a vital reference work for students and scholars, since it also contains a Greek-English lexicon and an extensive cross-referencing system. It runs to more than 800 pages in a large format.

During 1979, the *Concordance* will be sold at the special price of £22.50. From 1 January 1980, the price will increase to £25.00.

**SCM PRESS LTD  
58 Bloomsbury Street  
London WC1B 3QX**

## Contents

David Hill, Some Recent Trends in Matthaean Studies	139- 149
R.H.E.Uprichard, Exposition of 1 Thessalonians 4. 13- 18	150- 156
Martin McNamara, Half a Century of Targum Study	157- 168
E.A.Russell, "They believed Philip preaching" (Acts 8.12)	169- 176
James D.G.Dunn, "They believed Philip preaching" (Acts 8.12): A Reply	177- 183
<u>Reviews:</u> Tissa Balasuriya, Eucharist and Human Liberation( J.W.Morrow); W.Zimmerli, OT Theology in Outline(D.R.G.Beattie); Charlotte Klein, Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology (E.A.R.); J.D.G.Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the NT (E.A.R.); R.S.Anderson, Ed., Theological Foundations of Ministry (John Thompson)	184- 199



Some recent trends in Matthaean Studies

David Hill

In presenting this survey of Matthaean studies I shall confine myself, in the main, to making some observations on the major trends in redaction- or editorial-criticism of the Gospel in recent years. This is the theological method which underlies the work and exegesis of commentators on Matthew in the majority of cases at the present time.

1. The two-source theory (that Matthew is dependent on Mark and the tradition normally labelled 'Q') still dominates approaches to Matthew's composition, but we have to recognize that greater caution is required in assuming that this is the only sound basis of study. The work of W.R. Farmer /1 and Dom Bernard Orchard /2 (which revives the claim of Matthaean priority in accordance with Griesbach's hypothesis of two centuries ago): the suggestion of M.D.Goulder /3 that all that is distinctive in Matthew's Gospel is to be accounted for on the basis of its author's midrashic expansion of Mark: and the interesting thesis of J.M.Rist /4 that Matthew and Mark are independent and their similarities due to their common use of a very ancient, oral tradition: these developments must now make us less certain that we can discover what is distinctive in Matthew's work and theology by comparing his content with Mark and a reconstructed 'Q' source. Nonetheless it is my opinion that the search for and discovery of what is distinctively Matthaean in theological outlook does not depend on the two-source theory: a different method of approach, indeed different presuppositions about composition need not lead to different conclusions about Matthew's theological intention. Matthew's theology ( and, for that matter, the theology of any of the evangelists) as a totality depends on his gospel as a whole and not solely on what is distinctive in his editorial arrangement, alterations, and so forth. Redaction-criticism has justly been criticized for building massive theological hypotheses on very tiny pieces of editorial evidence.

2. As far as the literary structure of Matthew is concerned, B.W.Bacon's 'five-book' hypothesis /5 has found very little support. According to this theory Matthew arranged his narrative and discourse material into five

major sections in order to make a correspondence with the Pentateuch. This procedure has been rightly criticized for overlooking the discourses in chapters 11 and 23, for making the Infancy and Passion narratives into mere appendices to the whole, and for failing to point to any convincing correspondences between the content of the Pentateuch and Matthew's Gospel. In his recent Clarendon Bible Commentary H. Benedict Green /6 thinks that the real division in the gospel comes between chapters 10 and 11. Up to chapter 10 Matthew selects and drastically redistributes Markan material in order to form a consecutive narrative which answers the question 'Who is this?'. This is done by presenting a comprehensive but essentially static picture of Jesus in five clearly defined phases- his origins (1-2), the circumstances of his first public appearance in Israel (3.1-4.16), his definitive interpretation of Torah (4.17- 7.27, the Sermon on the Mount), his messianic acts of power (7.28-9.34, the ten miracles), and his inauguration of the continuing mission of the disciples (9.35 - 10.42, the missionary discourse). Chapter 11 recapitulates this and with chapter 12- when Matthew begins to follow Mark very closely- the narrative really gathers momentum, and it is a narrative of the rejection of the Christ by his own people. Although Green thinks that there is a parallel to this kind of division in the books of Chronicles with reference to the figure of David and the subsequent history of his house, this does not seem to be a very convincing solution to the structure of Matthew's gospel.

Much more plausible is the view of J.D. Kingsbury in his important book Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom. /7 Instead of focussing on the five-fold formula "and when Jesus had finished (these sayings)"- used to stress the fact that it is Jesus Messiah who has uttered the discourse and that consequently the contents have the status of divine revelation- Kingsbury regards the formula "From that time Jesus began..(apo tote exxato)" in 4.17 and 16.21 as indicative of the major divisions of the gospel: the person of Jesus Messiah (1.1-4.16); the proclamation of Jesus Messiah (4.17- 16.20) with positive and negative responses thereto; the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Messiah (16.20- 28.20). This is not quite the scheme with which Eduard Schweizer works in his excellent commentary /8 (though it is close to it), but, in my view, Kingsbury's division



is the best we have so far been offered.

3. Recent work has increased our awareness of the problems that Matthew had to confront in his community. Detailed analysis of the Parables chapter (13.1-52) has led Kingsbury ( in his book devoted to that chapter /9) to list the following issues as matters of concern for the evangelist- materialism, secularism, spiritual slothfulness, hatred among Christians, lovelessness, apostasy and lawlessness -, while, from his intense study of chapter 18, W.G.Thompson in Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community /3 has concluded that Matthew's congregation or community was badly divided: scandal was a constant threat (18.5-9), and the need for fraternal correction was urgent (18.15-20). On the positive side Schweizer has described the church of the first gospel as the body of 'these little ones', the mikroi who are ready to follow Jesus, to remain obedient to the law of God as interpreted by Jesus' deeds and words, to re-interpret his instruction ever anew in answer to practical problems, his word and let it speak to present situations and to revive his miraculous power in healings. /11

Most scholars continue to place Matthew and his community in Syria, Phoenicia or Palestine (though a few voices are raised in dissent, asserting that he is the spokesman for a Gentile community, possibly in Alexandria /12), but a far more important concern than localisation is Matthew's and Matthew's church's relationship to Judaism. Is Matthew writing at a time when the split between church and synagogue has taken place, that is, after about 85 AD when the "banning of heretics" clause was inserted into the Eighteen Benedictions, thus effectively driving the Christians out of the synagogues for good? Or is he writing at a time before the decisive break occurred, possibly even before 70 AD? This is an extremely difficult question to answer, for evidence can be used to support either point of view. But, in my view, Matthew was not hostile to the faith of Israel ( in which he was probably brought up) but rather to the hypocritical religion of the scribes and Pharisees ( which hypocrisy he fears may be found among Christian leaders as well) which is a perversion of the true faith of Israel. When one considers Matthew's use of the term 'righteousness' and notes that he makes Jesus plead for a "righteousness that exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees" ( 5.20), when one examines what the evangelist hands on (as tradition) about Jesus' attitude to the law, I find it difficult to say that he has severed all links with



emerging Judaism to the extent of denying that the Jews have any longer a hope of being part of the true or new Israel of God. They will not have any special place in the new people of God (as they do for Paul), but they may - and Matthew hopes that some will, as he himself has done - recognize Jesus as indeed Messiah and become incorporated into the 'true Israel'. /13

Here I digress - relevantly I hope - for a moment. We must not interpret Matthew via Paul. So significant a figure was Paul in the early decades of the Church's life that we are apt to assume that the problems he confronted and answered - about law, works, righteousness or justification - were problems that emerged in every Christian community. This need not be the case and is unlikely to have been the case. In my opinion the total thrust of Matthew's Gospel is witness to a situation in which the transition from Jewish faith to Christianity was easier than that presupposed in Paul's major letters. For Matthew salvation, to a considerable extent, is radical obedience to the law as interpreted, in its messianic intensity by Jesus. These are categories acceptable in Jewish ears, provided Jesus' messiahship is recognised - hence Matthew's repeated attempts to convince his readers of that fact, especially in the birth narratives. If Mark presents the profound picture of Christian discipleship as a being 'on the road' with Jesus to the Cross, out of which new, resurrected life emerges, Matthew is more down to earth and helps the pilgrim in via to know what 'following' means, and that mainly in terms of obedience to the law as truly interpreted and fulfilled in Jesus' words and deeds; and that obedience, that righteousness is ultimately measured by the double love-commandment, by one's attitude towards the neighbour and towards God (22. 37-40). If one examines the meanings of anomia (lawlessness) in Paul and Matthew, one sees a distinct difference: Paul understands lawlessness as an enslaving consequence of the powers of sin, law and death, whereas Matthew depends on the OT and regards lawlessness as an offence against the divinely-ordained law which Jesus came, not to annul, but to bring to its ultimate and intense fulfilment. This is not to push a wedge between Matthew and Paul: it is to recognize that each has his own way of responding to the situation he confronts and to plead that each be heard on his own terms.

4. We have already entered upon discussion of Matt-

hew's theology, which is our major concern in this paper. Several prominent scholars (following Hans Conzelmann's view of Luke's theology) argue that Matthew divides salvation-history into three segments: (i) the era of Israel, that is, the time of preparation, or the pre-history of Messiah; (ii) the era of Jesus' mission to Israel; and (iii) the era of the Church, that is, the world mission lasting until the eschaton. But all such threefold schemata for the first gospel are based on the assumption that ecclesiology is Matthew's overriding concern, whereas Kingsbury is, in all probability, right in claiming that Christology is his dominant concern. Hence he sees only two major epochs, the time of Israel and the time of Jesus: the so-called time of the Church is really only an extension of the time of Jesus. The former- the time of Israel- was inaugurated by Abraham and the latter by the ministry of John the Baptist, and the two are related in terms of promise and fulfilment.

Nearly every study of a particular passage or of Matthew's Gospel as a whole makes a contribution to the understanding of the evangelist's Christology, but the nearest thing to a comprehensive statement from a redaction-critical perspective is to be found in the central section of Kingsbury's book Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom which sets forth views first published in articles in various scholarly journals. His thesis is that the title 'Son of God' is the central term; it extends to every phase of Jesus' life, is the natural complement of the thoroughly Matthaean 'my Father', and represents the most exalted confession of Matthew's community. The words 'God with us' in 1.23 constitute Matthew's 'thumb-nail' definition of the signification of 'Son of God' and indeed the rest of the Gospel may be seen as an elaboration of the implications of the phrase ( as the closing paragraph, 28: 16-20 suggests). As to the title Kyrios (Lord) Kingsbury accepts Gunther Bornkamm's thesis that for Matthew this is a divine name of majesty, but he insists that it is nonetheless an auxiliary christological title the function of which is 'to attribute to Jesus divine authority in his capacity as the Messiah, Son of David, Son of God or Son of Man'. /14

One of Kingsbury's more provocative suggestions is his claim that 'Son of Man' largely coincides with 'Son of God' in terms of content, but is to be distinguished from the



latter primarily on a formal basis: 'Son of Man' is a public term or title, rather than a confessional one: it is the one with which Jesus encounters the world( Jews first and then Gentiles ), and particular opponents and unbelievers. Here, in my view, the evidence is being subjected to Procrustean treatment. Is it credible, for instance, that Matthew can use 'Son of Man' at 20.28 only because it is the mother of James and John (i.e. an unbeliever or opponent ) whose request provokes the utterance? Again, is it credible that the scribe (8.19) is being cast in the role of opponent because he evokes the saying, "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head"? The scribe's relation to Jesus is no worse, probably better, than the would-be follower who is described in 8.21 as "Another of the disciples". While Kingsbury's observation that "Matthew's primary interest in the Son of Man has to do with its association with the parousia" /15 has a certain validity on the basis of statistics, it would be more accurate to say simply that Matthew shows a special interest in the parousia! Since statements about Jesus' role at the parousia are almost exclusively attributed to Jesus rather than to someone else, it ought not to surprise us that the term 'Son of Man' occurs frequently in these statements as the title by which Jesus traditionally referred to himself. That is to say: Kingsbury is right in seeking to establish a formal distinction between 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God' as a confessional term (for which Kyrios must substitute when believers address the Son of God vocatively ); but the formal function of ho huios tou anthropou is not only public, nor does it always have opponents in view. It is simply the peculiar way of referring to himself attributed to Jesus by the tradition (whether genuine or not) and accepted without question by Matthew. A refinement or development of Kingsbury's emphasis on 'Son of God' in Matthew's gospel is to suggest that, since God's covenanted will is the Torah, so Jesus, Son of God, is Torah incarnate, the enfleshing of both the demand and the promise of the covenant, since he is 'God with us'. /16 Along similar lines M.J.Suggs has put forward a case for assuming that Matthew took over Wisdom speculation ( and Wisdom and Torah are closely related, even identified, in Jewish thought) from the Q tradition, but used Wisdom themes in a unique way to identify Jesus with Wisdom. He is not Wisdom's last or

final envoy (that is a Lucan theme), but Wisdom incarnate.  
 /17 And as the Incarnation of Wisdom, Jesus also becomes the embodiment of the Torah.

5. No review of Matthaean scholarship can omit reference to the evangelist's use of the OT, both the allusions and, more especially, the explicit fulfilment-quotations. The present state of research on this topic would permit the following propositions:

(i) The formula-citations ("This took place to fulfil what the Lord had spoken by the prophet....."), having a mixed textual form, constitute a special category.

(ii) The postulate of a collection of OT testimonia, used by Christian writers, does not explain the situation. Why are there differences in the form and content of the quotations between their source and the gospel?

(iii) Krister Stendahl's theory /18 that the formula quotations reflect Christian scribal activity similar to that which produced the Qumran pescharim has not now widespread acceptance, chiefly because the OT quotations in the Qumran Habbakuk commentary function as "pegs for interpretation" whereas in Matthew they 'point' the evangelist's words, and because formulae citations are not so closely integrated with the contexts in which they appear as Stendahl assumes. Nevertheless, the idea that there lies behind the gospel of Matthew a group or school of scripture study is plausible, although the formula-citations- probably originating in a missionary preaching tradition which employed scriptural proofs against opponents- do not unambiguously point in that direction.

(iv) The citations reflect the evangelist's theology and are part of his work as redactor. But for what purpose are they employed? To undergird Matthew's opinion with another (authoritative) opinion? To 'ring bells' in his readers' minds? Probably more: to show that Jesus' life and ministry fulfil OT prophecy, or to proclaim (rather than prove) that Jesus is the Messiah. In my view, the latter is most probable. /19 The main concern of Matthew is Christological.

6. One of the problems which confronts the student of Matthew's gospel is the contrast between particularism and universalism. Only Matthew contains the instruction by Jesus to his disciples, "Go nowhere among the Gentiles and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10.5f), words which are taken up again in his saying to the Canaanite woman



"I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15.24). The authenticity of these words (and one logion may lie behind both sayings) is of the highest probability. The language has a strongly Semitic character, and the Church which from pre-Pauline times had been engaged in mission (Acts 11.20ff) would not have created such a particularistic saying. "Matthew's only reason for preserving the logion", says Jeremias of 10.5-6, /20 "was that it bore the stamp of the Lord's authority"; and that would be a very good reason for Matthew's inclusion of it.

But additional reasons for the inclusion of the particularistic sayings can be adduced. The Matthaean community was concerned to know about the history out of which it came and the evangelist provides this. The story of Israel's tragic rejection of the Messiah (especially on the part of her leaders) had to be told and in the telling attitudes toward the Jews which had been emerging in the first half-century of the Church's life found expression. Moreover, the Matthaean church was intensely aware of being the heir of God's promises and purposes. This is unmistakably clear in its understanding of the law and of scripture. The refusal of Israel to receive her Messiah becomes the decisive reason for the Kingdom passing to the Church: it is the new creation built upon the foundations which the unbelieving Jews were unwilling to accept, but it is not an exclusive community. And that is where the universal mission - commanded by the risen Christ in 28.16-20 - comes in. The apostles are to make disciples of 'all nations', and the Jews are surely included in the scope of that command. Members of Israel (as distinct from the 'chosen people' as a whole) Matthew hopes - and his purpose in writing his gospel is evidence of the hope - will embrace Jesus as Messiah and form part of the new people, the true Israel of God. /21 There is no conflict between the so-called particularistic and universal missions if one does not accept a three-epoch scheme for Matthew's view of Heils-Geschichte, but sees the 'time of the Church' as an extension or continuation of the 'time of Jesus' - Messiah rejected, Son of God and Lord vindicated and triumphant, directing his Church to mission to all nations.

7. Finally, a few words on the authorship of the gospel. Early tradition is unanimous in naming the apostle Matthew as the author of the book. The key witness is Papias who declares that "Matthew compiled the logia in the

Hebrew dialect and each one translated them as he was able". Although it is possible (and some think probable) that Papias meant our present gospel, it would be extremely hard to argue that our Matthew is a translation from a Semitic tongue. As it stands, it was written in Greek by one who could, when left to himself (i.e., if not dependent on Mark or Q), compose good, grammatical Greek. Nevertheless, as C.F.D. Moule has said, "it is difficult to see how the tradition of a Semitic and apostolic original sprang up at all if there is absolutely nothing behind it." /22

The tradition can be adequately accounted for if we postulate a Semitic sayings-source, identifiable, at least in part, with the material designated by 'Q' and compiled by the apostle Matthew, the former tax-collector. Such a person would certainly have been literate and, as a provincial employee in Galilee, would have known Greek, as well as Hebrew and Aramaic, and possibly a few words in Latin (in 5.42 million is a Latinism). Moule relates Matthew's occupation to the well-known saying in 13.52 about the scribe (grammateus) who is trained or disciplined (mathēteutheis, a verb which may be a hint at Matthew's name, occurring as it does three times in Matthew's gospel and only once elsewhere in the NT) to the Kingdom and brings out of his treasure things new and old. /23

These words- often regarded as the author's signature - are usually interpreted as relating to a rabbinic scribe, but Moule suggests that grammateus should be interpreted as a secular scribe or clerk. "Is it not conceivable", he says, /24 "that the Lord really did say to that tax-collector Matthew, 'You have been a writer (as the Navy would put it). You have had plenty to do with the commercial side of just the topics alluded to in the parables - farmer's stock, fields, treasure trove, fishing, revenues. Now that you have become a disciple you can bring all this out again, but with a difference'. And is it not conceivable that this was a saying actually recorded in Aramaic by the tax collector turned disciple? It shows clearer signs of a Semitic base than some other parts of the Gospel.' However this may be - and Moule admits it is speculative (we might even say 'romantic')- there is no straining of evidence in supposing that a tax-collector like Matthew could have recorded sayings of Jesus in Aramaic. Knowledge and use of this very significant material, composed by an apostle, may well have caused the gospel which first included it to be called kata Matthaion.

It is hoped that this short review of recent studies



on the Gospel of Matthew will have demonstrated to the reader the interest and complexity of the various problems which confront the scholar who devotes his attention to the first gospel. Many questions remain unanswered; many hypotheses accepted by some and rejected by others; but what is the case with reference to the state of scholarship on Matthew's gospel is true of virtually every book in the NT and, I presume, in the OT as well.

### Notes

1. W.R.Farmer, The Synoptic Problem (London-New York, 1964; 2nd ed. 1976)
2. B.Orchard, Matthew, Luke and Mark (Koinonia Press, Manchester, 1976).
3. M.D.Goulder, Midrash and Lection in Matthew (SPCK, London, 1974)
4. J.M.Rist, On the Independence of Matthew and Mark (SNTS Monograph Series 32: University Press, Cambridge, 1978)
5. B.W.Bacon, Studies in Matthew (Constable, London, 1930): this particular hypothesis was first published as "The 'Five books' of Matthew against the Jews" in The Expositor, 15(1918), 56-66.
6. H.B.Green, The Gospel according to Matthew (Clarendon Bible Series, University Press, Oxford, 1975), pp.16ff
7. J.D.Kingsbury, Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom (SPCK, London, 1976), pp.7-37.
8. E.Schweizer, The Good News according to Matthew (Eng. trans.SPCK, London, 1976)
9. J.D.Kingsbury, The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A study in Redaction Criticism (SPCK, London, 1969, 3rd reprinted ed. 1976).
10. W.G.Thompson, Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt. 17.22 - 18.35 (Analecta Biblica 44; Biblical Institute, Rome, 1970)
11. E.Schweizer, "Observance of Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew", NTS, 16 (1969-70), 213-30.
12. S.van Tilborg, The Jewish Leaders in Matthew (Brill, Leiden, 1972). An intriguing case for the Transjordanian origin of Matthew, perhaps in Pella, has been presented by H.D.Slingerland in Journal for the Study of the NT, 3(April 1979), 18-28.
13. See the comments in the introduction to my commentary on Matthew's Gospel (Century Bible Series: Oliphants, London. 1972), pp.69-72; contra D.R.A.Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution in the Gospel according to St.

Matthew (SNTS Monograph Series 6; University Press, Cambridge, 1967)

14. Kingsbury, Structure, p.105

15. Kingsbury, op.cit., p.114

16. Cf. J.M.Gibbs, "The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew, Studia Evangelica IV (Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1968), 38-46.

17. M.J.Suggs, Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1970)

18. K.Stendahl, The School of St.Matthew and its use of the OT (Uppsala, 1954; reprinted by Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1968)

19. Cf. the section on Matthew 1-2 in Raymond Brown's most impressive book, The Birth of the Messiah (Chapman, London, 1978); it is interesting to note that Brown regards the formula-quotations in these two chapters (The Matthaean Infancy narrative) as having come to Matthew in tradition and not as inserted by the evangelist.

20. J.Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations (SCM., London, 1959), p.27.

21. Cf. the arguments of Kenzo Tagawa, "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew", NTS, 16(1969-70), 149-62, especially 158ff.

22. C.F.D.Moule, The Birth of the NT (A. and C.Black, London, 1962), p.89.

23. This verse, Mt.13.52 has recently been employed as a designation of the evangelist's method of working by O.Lamar Cope, Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5: Washington, D.C., 1976). He does not think it contains a clue to the actual identity of the evangelist, but says of the writer, "The author of Matthew was a Jewish-Christian so thoroughly familiar with the OT and with Jewish traditions of its interpretation that it was natural for him to employ this knowledge as a key to the organisation of his gospel. Where he has done this, he reveals to the reader certain of his characteristic ideas and beliefs. He also reveals his understanding of the relationship between the tradition about Jesus and the OT and the relationship of both to the problems of Christians of his own day. He probably thought of himself as 'a scribe trained for Kingdom of heaven.' " (p.130)

24. C.F.D.Moule, "Some neglected Features in Matthew's Gospel", StEv II (Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1963), 91-99.



R.H.E.Uprichard: Exposition of 1 Thessalonians 4.13-18

The section 1 Thessalonians 4.13-18 stands among various exhortations which Paul gives to the Thessalonians in his letter. There is a sense in which 4.13 introduces a new subject for exhortation, viz., the return of Christ, the parousia. Detail concerning Christ's return forms the substance of the exhortation given from 1 Thess. 4.13 to 1 Thess. 5.11. The first part of this material, 1 Thess. 4.13-18, deals with the problem of those Christians who had died before the Parousia. The second, 1 Thess. 5.1-11, is concerned with the sudden unexpected nature of Christ's return and the effect this should have on the believer's daily living.

This is not to say that the whole subject of the parousia was entirely new to the Thessalonians. It seems clear that Paul had already given instruction to them on this matter, perhaps on his founding mission ( 1 Thess. 5.1). There are frequent allusions to this very theme in the letter itself ( 1.10; 2.19; 3.11; 5.23). But the way in which the subject is introduced, and the substance of the teaching given in 1 Thess 4.13-18 is decidedly new, and in this it stands in contrast to 1 Thess 5.1-11, where Paul comments on their knowledge of the facts he is about to give. " But we would not have you ignorant, brethren" ( v13) is a phrase we find Paul using when he wished to introduce some point which is important and which may be new to his hearers ( Rom 1.13; 9.25; 1 Cor. 10.1; 12.1; 2 Cor. 1.8). As such it draws attention to the significance of what is to follow. The fact that in 1 Thess 4.9 and 4.13 we find the phrase ' peri de ' (= 'and concerning') and 'de peri ' occurring respectively has led to the suggestion, in the light of the repetition of this phrase in 1 Corinthians, that Paul is here replying to written enquiries from the Thessalonians. This need not, however, have been the case. He may equally well have been responding to oral questions put to him. It does however seem to suggest that he answers questions on which his advice had been sought.

The problem dealt with by Paul in 1 Thess 4.13-18 appears to have been quite a specific one. Essentially it was an answer to the question, "Would Christians who had died before the Lord's return be at any disadvantage, or even miss that event when it occurred?" The matter is couched in quite general terms in v13, "concerning those

who are asleep that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope." The contrast here would seem naturally to be between the Christian and the non-Christian reaction to death. The Christian dead are described as 'asleep' (present participle) which seems not merely to be a meaningful euphemism but also to anticipate a future awakening.

The total depression and gloom of the pagan attitude to death can be substantiated in contemporary literature and inscriptions. From this, it might be thought that perhaps the Thessalonians' problem was simply fear that their dead had through being denied resurrection, forfeited existence completely. That this was not the case seems evident in Paul's teaching in this section. He lays little stress on the believer's resurrection, but rather takes it for granted. He moves directly from their condition of sleep to their accompanying Christ at his return. He is concerned to emphasize that those surviving to the parousia will have no precedence over the Christian dead at that event. Indeed, the dead will rise 'first'. The burden of the comfort afforded by his instruction is in the simultaneous ('hama sun'='together with') nature of the rapture of survivors and Christian dead, and in their eternal union with their Lord. The problem is obviously not the general one of the believer's immortality but rather the specific matter already mentioned.

As such, the problem was quite distinct from other difficulties in connection with the parousia and the after-life in Paul's letters. In 1 Thess 5 the nature of the parousia is the matter under discussion. This theme seems to be developed in 2 Thessalonians, where some evidently thought the day of the Lord had arrived and were given instruction on the order of events preceding the End. In 1 Cor 15 the difficulty seemed to be more related to the concept of bodily resurrection, perhaps on the background of the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul. But the problem in 1 Thess 4.13-18 is one which we could naturally anticipate in an early Christian community, where deaths of believers would occur within a context where the Lord's return was expected soon. Indeed, in the light of 1 Cor 11.30 with its link between death and God's judgment, the tension caused by the demise of believers would be particularly heightened.

But what answer does Paul give to this particular problem of the Thessalonians? He assures them that their dead will be at no disadvantage whatsoever when the Lord



returns. In this respect, he indicates that the ground of the believers' hope rests on two historical events and traces out the implications of these events for the believers. The first of these is the death and resurrection of Christ which he mentions in v14; the second is the parousia of Christ which he deals with in vv 15-17.

1. The death and resurrection of Christ (v14). The way in which Paul alludes to these occurrences emphasizes both their historicity and their authority. The use of the name 'Jesus', which is comparatively rare in Paul may well direct our attention to the earthly life of our Lord. More likely, however, the context reflects a credal connotation: "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again." In this connection, it is significant that here Paul uses 'anistemi'(='raise'), not 'egeirein'(also='raise'). He uses the latter much more frequently, and when he does cite the former, it is in quotations (Rom 5.12; 1 Cor 10.7 of Eph 5.14 ). Is Paul then here reminding the Thessalonians of a basic primitive tenet of their faith, a faith lodged firmly in the historical events of the earthly life of Jesus? Certainly the format in which they occur lends strong probability to this suggestion.

The conditional form in which the sentence is put underscores the importance of these historical events for the believer: "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep." At first reading, the form of the sentence might seem to suggest some doubt as to the Thessalonians' belief in these facts. This is not at all the purpose. It is rather meant to emphasize that belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus, basic undisputed facts of the Thessalonians' faith, carry these overwhelming implications which Paul goes on to express. Indeed the very way in which Paul alludes to these implications clarifies the point. After the expression "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again", we would expect some statement like "Even so we ought to believe.....". But this is not the case. Paul moves directly from his proposition concerning belief to a statement of fact. It is precisely because the Thessalonians believe in the death and resurrection of Christ, that they can be assured that God will bring their departed loved ones with Jesus at the parousia. It is on the grounds of Christ's death and resurrection that comfort and assurance are offered to Christians concerning their loved ones who have died in the Lord. These are the bases of the be-

lievers' solace regarding his believing friends at a time of bereavement. What greater foundation of comfort, what stronger encouragement of hope can we have than these?

The phrase 'through Jesus' can be taken either with 'bring' ( as RSV) or with 'asleep' ( as AV). While there is some degree of difficulty in accepting the sense of 'asleep through Jesus', this seems preferable on the following grounds: it is clumsy to qualify 'bring' with both phrases; it provides a greater balance to the sentence as a whole to take the phrase with 'asleep'; it clarifies that it is the dead to whom the reference is made and it assures the bereaved that a relationship with Christ even in death is maintained, in keeping with Paul's purpose.

2. The parousia of Christ( vv 15-17). This is the second ground to which Paul directs the Thessalonians in comforting them concerning their departed friends. Again, the form and content of this teaching not only comes with great authority to the Thessalonians but offers direct and precise assurance to them concerning the matter which troubles them.

The instruction given them is "by (literally" in") the word of the Lord"(v15). It is difficult to define exactly what Paul means by this expression. Various suggestions have been made: (i) a saying of the Lord, with reference to Matt 24.30f; John 6.39; Mark 9.1; but the precise truth taught in 1 Thess 4.15f is hardly evident in these sayings and there are no strong verbal parallels;

(ii) a reference to 4 Esdras 5.41; but the verbal links are slight and literary dependence unlikely.

(iii) a special revelation given to Paul as an apostle; this is possible though the phrase 'Word of the Lord' seems to point more to the actual words of Jesus rather than to a revelation.

(iv) an opinion of Paul as he speaks in the Spirit(of 1 Cor 7.25-40); but the expression is too precise.

(v) an 'agraphon', an unwritten saying of our Lord; but this is purely conjectural and can neither be proved or disproved.

Whatever the origin of the saying, it serves to add authority to the teaching he is about to give. It comes with the authority of the exalted Lord to men's hearts.



Not merely the form but the details of the revelation support its authority. This is clear in a variety of ways: the event is described as 'parousia' (v15), a term used for the arrival of a great civic dignitary or royal personage; closely linked in thought with this 'parousia' is the term 'apantesis' (= 'meeting'), which suggests the formal reception of the distinguished personage.

The note of authority and majesty is also clear in the apocalyptic descriptions of the event. We have the 'keleusma' (v16), 'a cry of command', used of the charioteer to his horses, or of the hunter to his hounds, or of the ship's master to his rowers. It includes urgency as well as authority. It does not seem clear who issues the command or to whom it is issued. The former is perhaps the Lord. The note of authority continues with the expression "the archangel's call". It is hardly possible to make any specific identification in the light of the absence of the article with 'archangel'. "The sound of the trumpet of God" completes the rousing picture, typical of apocalyptic imagery. On two occasions in 1 Cor 15.52 Paul mentions the trumpet in connection with the parousia and it is frequently associated with divine activity in the OT (Exodus 19.16; Isaiah 27.13; Joel 2.1; Zechariah 9.14). It links up with the final judgment in our Lord's teaching (Matt 24.31). It is not clear whether the three descriptions, 'cry of command', 'archangel's call', 'sound of the trumpet', refer to one sound only or to three separate entities, though the latter seems to be more probable.

The sovereign emphasis continues in the description of the actual event of Jesus' arrival. It is the Lord 'himself' ('autos') who descends. The believers are 'caught up'. The verb 'harpazo' means to 'seize', 'carry off by force', thus the compulsive nature of the 'rapture' is reflected. The believers are caught up 'in the clouds' - a frequent symbol of an OT theophany. They are to meet the Lord 'in the air', conceived of as the abode of all kinds of evil spirits, where Christ's triumph with his people is now complete.

The emphasis is on the sovereign act of Jesus, the Lord bringing solace and hope for the believer amid circumstances of bereavement.

The parousia of the Lord also carries implications for the believer which allay his fears for his departed friends. "We who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord shall not precede those who have fallen asleep."

This is sometimes said to imply that Paul at this stage believed that he would survive to the parousia, while at a later point in his writings he altered his view. This does not necessarily seem to have been the case. The 'we' can simply be taken in a general sense as indicating those who are surviving at the time. It is noticeable that at 5.10 Paul leaves the matter open in the allusion "whether we wake or sleep", not committing himself on that particular occasion to any definite view.

More important here is the emphasis on the fact that the survivors will on no account precede the 'dead in Christ' who are raised first. Paul uses the double negative 'ou me' (v15), "shall NOT forestall those who have died" (NEB) - thus Paul gives his answer to the fears which haunted the Thessalonians. Is Paul here quoting from words of our Lord? He uses 'ou me', and 90% of the occurrences of this in the NT either come from passages quoted from the Lxx or from words of the Lord. The word for 'forestall' is 'phthano' and of seven occurrences of the word in the NT, five are from Paul and two from the Q source in the Gospel. The latter two are sayings of our Lord. Thus we have additional evidence for suggesting that Paul is perhaps quoting from the sayings of Jesus, thus strengthening his reply to the Thessalonians' anxieties.

Indeed far from being at any disadvantage, the order of events is such that the dead will be raised 'first' (v16). Only then will events proceed to their climax. And, in case the thought of being separated from their loved ones, even in their risen condition should trouble them, Paul in this word of the Lord, stresses that they will be caught up together with their risen friends and be for all time with their Lord (v17).

The comfort in this revelation lies not merely in the order of events at the parousia but also in the constancy of the relationship of the believer, whether dead or alive, with Christ, which underlies the whole passage. According to the particular interpretation given to v14, we depict the dead as either sleeping through Jesus or brought back by God at the parousia through Jesus. It is their relationship to him which is basic to the comfort. In v16 they are described as the 'dead in Christ'. While this may indicate merely a description of the believers who have died, it could imply something more. Paul as so often thinks of the integral union 'in Christ'. The ultimate consolation is in the prospect of both survivors and the raised being "with the Lord" for ever (v18). Paul



here uses 'sun' ('together') though he might have used 'meta' (= 'together' also). It would appear however that invariably in eschatological contexts he uses 'sun', while other NT writers appear to prefer 'meta' in eschatological contexts. There is little discernible difference in meaning. But Paul also uses 'sun' in compounds which speak of dying, suffering, living, rising with Christ (Rom 6.3-11; Gal 2.19; Rom 8.17; Col 2.12-3.5 ) and the use of the same term is hardly insignificant. Does this suggest here a relationship with Christ in his glory of the parousia akin to the believer's relationship with him in his saving activity? At the very least identification with Christ forms the basis of consolation here.

Thus it is as believers contemplate the great historic event of Christ's death and resurrection, as they look forward to his royal advent to meet them, as they see in such an event the blessings for both the living and the dead, as they recall the constancy of their relationship to Christ in life and in death, and its glorious climax at his return, that they will be able truly to comfort one another (v18). It will be no mere comfort in words but rather a real 'paraklesis' (= comfort). They will thus stand side by side and strengthen one another in knowledge of these truths. They will come alongside one another to comfort and encourage in the light of the word of the Lord. Such a word will relate to their condition of distress and offer them eternal hope.

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES: ISSUE 1: July 1979

## HALF A CENTURY OF TARGUM STUDY. MARTIN McNAMARA

The Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible, commonly known as Targums or Targumim, have in recent years been the subject of intense study. The rapid development of this branch of enquiry has, in fact, been almost incredible.

An idea of the extent of this development can be gathered from the special surveys and bibliographies that have been compiled and published. /1 The present situation in Targumic studies can best be seen in the light of the research and discoveries carried out over the past fifty years. Before considering this contemporary situation, I believe it best to review first the development over the relevant decades.

1. The Situation in 1930

The year 1930 proved to be a turning-point in targumic studies. It marked the end of one era and the beginning of a new approach that is still with us

(i) Targums known in 1930

The Aramaic texts of the Targums available to students in 1930 were basically those that had been known for centuries. For the Pentateuch there was the Targum traditionally ascribed to Onkelos, the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum. The Targum of Onkelos tends to be a literal rendering, sparing in paraphrase. The form of Aramaic in which it is written is related to the Aramaic of the Bible, and yet somewhat later than this in its grammatical forms. In language, as in the nature of its paraphrase, Onkelos is set off from Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum, whose form of Aramaic is related to that of Jewish Palestinian and Galilaean sources. Whereas Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan contain a rendering of the entire Pentateuch, the Fragment Targum, as the very name implies, has a rendering of only certain sections, sometimes of just a few words. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan continues since 1930 to present special problems, particularly with regard to its relation to the Targum of Onkelos. It is clearly a composite work. While some sections seem to be very old, there are also recent references—such as the mention of the names of the wife and



daughter of Muhammed and of the six orders of the Mishnah. Portions of it are verbally identical with, or very similar to, Onkelos, both as regard language and paraphrase; others are similar to the Palestinian Targum as known from the Fragment Targum in 1930, and now as known from other texts also.

Together with these targums of the Pentateuch, there was also the Targum of the Prophets- the second section of the Hebrew Canon. In style and language, this targum was similar to that of Onkelos.

There were also targums known to all the books of the Writings (the 'Ketubim') with the exception of the books of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah- portions of which were in Aramaic in the original. /2

#### (ii). Date assigned to the Targums

The prevailing view in 1930 with regard to the dating of the Targums was that the oldest was Onkelos. Next came the Targum of the Prophets and, as much more recent, that of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum, the former as not any earlier than the seventh century AD. This dating of the Targums was due mainly to the influence of Gustav Dalman, a scholar who at an earlier stage in his researches thought that sections of Pseudo-Jonathan and of the Fragment Targum could well be very old, even pre-Christian but later changed his mind.

It must be admitted that the date of the available texts of both Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum presented a formidable obstacle with regard to assigning an early date to the paraphrases. These were no earlier than the sixteenth century.

#### (iii) Use of Targums in NT Studies

It was natural that this prevailing view of the date of the Targums should affect the use made of them in NT studies, though in this regard a change had taken place. Earlier some Christian scholars had freely used the targums in the belief that they antedated the Christian era. By 1930 however the targums tended to be set aside whether as witnesses for Jewish beliefs in the time of Christ or for an understanding of the NT itself.

This prevailing attitude was not however shared by all. In 1921 Rendal Harris had written on "Traces of Targumism in the New Testament" in the 'Expository Times' and other scholars re-echoed his sentiments on the utility of the Targums for NT research. The prevalent position however, based as it was

on a presumed late date, could only be effectively countered either by new finds, or by a new approach to the question of dating, or by a combination of both. It remained for the next two decades to provide this.

## 2. A New Approach 1930-1950 AD

This period opened and closed with an indication of new texts of the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch. It was also characterised by a new approach to the study of Jewish tradition and the dating of individual Jewish traditions. The first texts to be published were the fragments of the Palestinian Targum, earlier found in the Geniza of Old Cairo. /3 The texts were quite extensive and represented all five books of the Pentateuch, though the greater part was from Genesis. The manuscripts ranged in date from the late 7th or early 8th century /4 to the 11th century. Thus we were provided with texts, partly at least nine hundred years or so older than the texts hitherto known. Yet despite being so much earlier, the type of paraphrase and language was in the main the same as that of the later texts.

Another significant development during this period was a renewed interest in the presence of Jewish midrashic and haggadic material in such early Jewish writings as the Septuagint Greek translation, the works of Josephus, and the Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo. Studies of this sort were preparing the way for a comparative study of Jewish traditions and providing material for the dating of portions at least of the midrash and haggada found in the Targums.

It was inevitable that the finds from Qumran from 1947 AD onwards should in due time affect a portion of scholarly opinion in regard to the value of the Targums for NT research. For one thing, the Qumran texts could be precisely dated, at latest from the first century AD. Then again, the Aramaic material from Qumran provided new evidence for at least one form of Aramaic being used in the Palestine of Jesus' day and, slightly earlier, a form of Aramaic rather similar to that of Onkelos but significantly different from that of the Palestinian Targums. /4 Another significant fact provided by the Qumran finds included the large sections of a Targum of Job and the small fragment of a Targum of Leviticus 16. The latter was again somewhat similar to the Onkelos kind of language and rendering. And last, but by no means least, there is the evidence for the Qumran interpretation of Scripture provided by the scrolls, both in the special scripture



commentaries or pesharim and in other writings of the sect. The Targum school of exegesis, if one may be allowed so to designate it, had in the Qumran school a very definite rival, or at least a body of evidence which could not be ignored: a clearly defined corpus of literature, coming from Palestine or its environs, dating in the time of Christ or shortly before it; possessing a certain understanding of the Scriptures, and in part written in Aramaic.

Despite this, however, interest in the newly maturing targumic approach was only beginning to gather momentum. The new science was greatly aided by another chance find just two years after the discovery of the first scrolls in Qumran. This was the find of the manuscript now known as Codex Neofiti 1 of the Vatican Library. As the enumeration suggests, it is the first manuscript of the Neofiti collection of manuscripts. These once belonged to the Pia Domus Neophytorum, a house founded in Rome for converts from Judaism. The manuscripts of the house and college were sold and transferred to the Vatican Library during the tenure of its last rector who took up office in 1886. This particular manuscript was catalogued as Onkelos and this may have been the principal reason for it not attracting the attention of scholars. A scholar by the name of Alexandro Diez Macho took a special interest in the Onkelos manuscripts and had a microfilm made of the manuscript in the first instance. He gradually came to realise that it was not Onkelos, but a full copy of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, the only one known to exist. He intimated his identification in 1956.

### 3. Contemporary Targum Studies 1950- 1979

The stage for modern research in the Targums had been firmly set by 1950. The study of Jewish tradition continued and gathered momentum. Special attention was devoted to midrash, to the Jewish attitude to Scriptures, to their interpretation in the light of new situations, and to the midrashic works in which this understanding of the scriptures was to be found. The study of Jewish midrash was pursued particularly by Madame Renee Bloch in the mid-fifties, but she was ably supported by others, notably Geza Vermes. Mme Bloch also made a detailed study of the criteria to be used for the determination of the age of otherwise undated Jewish traditions.

A work which was to become a classic in the presentation of the case for the use of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch in NT studies was the Cairo Geniza by Paul Kahle,

In the second edition of his work(1959), Kahle expresses himself as follows(p.208):

In the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, we have in the main material coming down from pre-Christian times which must be studied by everyone who wishes to understand the state of Judaism at the time of the birth of Christianity. And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it was similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians. It is material, the importance of which can scarcely be exaggerated.

Coincidentally, the date of this quote roughly marks the beginning of a new era in the use of the Targums in NT research, and in the use of the Palestinian Targums in particular. /5

The new studies tended to concentrate on the relationship of the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch with the NT. The range of such studies can be seen from a glance at one of the surveys or bibliographies noted at the beginning of this essay. Many points of contact between the two bodies of literature were noted. In the Targums, for instance, extensive use is made of such expressions as "The Word(Memra) of the Lord", or of the Lord's Glory( Shekinah ), possibly with the intention of safeguarding the divine transcendence. These terms and expressions were seen to have a relevance for the understanding of the use of 'Logos', 'glory' etc., in the Fourth Gospel. It is probably for the same reason that the Targums speak of God communicating his will to his people through his Word( Dibbera, Dibbura ) or through his spirit or holy spirit. In this, too, a relationship was seen with certain NT texts, e.g. 2 Corinthians 3.17. In the Palestinian Targum God is occasionally spoken of as "your(their, his...) Father in heaven"; we read of persons having merit "before their Father in heaven". We even find the expression: "Be merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful". The corresponding NT phrases naturally come to mind, and it was natural to conclude that Jesus and the early Christian community were merely using phrases current in the religious vocabulary of the Jews of their time. Other good Targumic phrases and terms of the same sort are " the great day of judgment", " this world-- the world to come", Gehenna, Paradise, redeemer, redemption.



The relationship between the two bodies of literature went far beyond such phrases and isolated terms. In the Targums we find a certain theology or tradition woven around certain persons or events in the biblical narrative, e.g., the events of the Garden of Eden, the sacrifice or binding of Isaac ( Genesis 22 ), the ladder of Jacob ( Genesis 28 ), the well of Jacob, circumcision, the well believed to have followed the Jews during the desert wanderings (cf 1 Corinthians 10.4) and others besides. The binding of Isaac in Jewish tradition was looked on as expiatory and this tradition was regarded by some scholars as the background against which Paul considered the death of Christ. The Targums have much to say on the Torah, identified with divine wisdom, regarded as the Tree of Life and thus salvific. These attributes of the Torah were regarded by scholars as affording St. Paul material for some of his statements on Christ. Thus Paul would have transferred to Christ what Jewish tradition, as found in the Targums, predicated of the law.

It must be stressed that the matter of the relationship of the Targums to the NT was the sole subject studied during this period. Targumics was becoming a branch of study in its own right, with special emphasis placed on the once neglected tradition of the Palestinian Targum, with special attention being devoted to the text of Neofiti. /6

Another point that has received attention is the transmission of the Palestinian Targum. As noted earlier, most of the major texts are late -- from the sixteenth century. However, with the aid of early Rabbinic citations and later Jewish writings, its history can be traced back beyond this late date. It is reasonably certain that a text of the Palestinian Targum, almost identical with that of Neofiti, was used by Rabbi Nathan ben Yehiel (died 1106) in the compilation of his dictionary known as the 'Aruk'. The Geniza texts and some early Rabbinic citations take us back beyond this.

The relationship of the Targums to Jewish midrashic ( haggadic and halakic ) tradition has also been studied. Here the most detailed study has been made by Rabbi Menahem Kasher, author of the huge twenty-five volume work, 'Torah Sheleimah', described in the sub-title as "a Talmudic-Midrashic Encyclopedia of the Pentateuch, containing a complete collection of commentary and notes from the earliest Hebrew works up to the Gaonic period". He was already well advanced in his researches when he made the acquaintance of Neofiti. He soon came to believe that its paraphrase was very old and treats of it in detail in volume 24 of his work. /7

The work is devoted to a study of the Aramaic versions of the Bible, with a comprehensive study of Onkelos, Jonathan ( i.e., Targum of the Prophets ), Jerusalem or Palestinian Targums, and the full Jerusalem Targum of Vatican manuscript, Neofiti 1. The title page further tells us that Kasher's work treats of "the original methods of these Targums, their relation to one another, and the analysis of their use as sources in post-biblical literature." Kasher's position is that Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti are basically from the time of Ezra, that the Mishnah depends on the Targums, likewise early (Beth Hillel, Beth Shammai ) and later Jewish tradition.

Together with these different studies, attempts were also made to refine the criteria for dating Jewish and targumic traditions.

In what is sometimes referred to as "the Kahle School" a certain attitude was discernible with regard to the Palestinian Targum and its relationship to the NT. The interpretative tradition enshrined in this Targum, if not the Targum itself, was generally assumed to be very old and basically pre-Christian. The Aramaic in which the tradition is now found, tended to be regarded as representing the spoken dialect of Galilee, if not of all Palestine, in the first century AD. Qumran Aramaic would then be a literary language rather than a spoken vernacular. The first position- regarding the antiquity of the tradition- was more strongly adhered to than the latter. As a rule of thumb on the antiquity of Jewish tradition in general, not merely that of the Palestinian Targum, Vermes could give the following: unless the contrary is proved, a Jewish tradition can be presumed to ante-date 135 AD. Positions were less dogmatic with regard to the date to be assigned to the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum. While this may conceivably be later than NT times- say post 200 AD- the tradition it enshrined was not thereby shown to be recent. The language could change, while the tradition it transmitted was older.

It was inevitable that the positions and presuppositions of the so-called 'Kahle' School should in time be challenged, both as regard the date to be assigned to the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum and then to the tradition itself. And with the antiquity of the targumic tradition called into question, the very utility of the Targums for NT research would naturally be queried.

The early date assigned to the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum was an obvious target for attack, since abundant material from Qumran was available for comparison. Some specialists in the history of Aramaic maintained that its peculiar forms showed that it was post 200 AD at the earliest. As against this, others maintained that the use of the Qumran material in this discussion was decisive and possibly not justified. The Qumran material represented the literary form of the language, whereas the Aramaic of the Targums would represent the spoken language, at least of Galilee. Another form of the argument for a late date for the Palestinian Targum runs as follows: the Qumran and literary documents represent the literary Aramaic of the schools of Judea prior to the destruction of these in the Bar Cochba revolt ( 135 AD), when the centre of Jewish life and literary activity moved to Galilee. Any literary work prior to 135 AD would be in this literary language. Since the Palestinian Targums are not, they are to be dated as post 135 AD. In a doctoral dissertation on the language of the Targum of the Former Prophets, A.Thal (Rosenthal) concluded that the Targum of the Prophets and Onkelos were composed before 135 AD, while Neofiti is to be assigned a date later than this.

The objection, however, was not limited to the question of language. The methodology used by scholars in their employment of targumic evidence in NT studies was queried. It was stated that they presumed rather than proved that the targumic tradition was old. They were accused of circular reasoning, proving from their relationship to the NT that the Targums were old and using them in NT research since they were presumed to be ancient.

The absence from Qumran documents of such typically targumic concepts and expressions as Memra, Shekinah, and Dibbera led some to query the age of the usage of these in Judaism.

Another point made in these criticisms is that because an identical or similar expression or tradition is found in both Targums and the NT, the dependence must be on the part of the latter. Could it not as easily have been the other way about - that the relationship is due to the dependence of Jewish tradition on the NT. This observation has been made with regard to such expressions as "Father in heaven". It has more recently been put forward with regard to the Aqedah or binding of Isaac theology i.e., the Jewish theol-



ogy found in the Palestinian Targum on the expiatory nature of the sacrifice of Isaac and, for that reason, used as a presumed background to Paul's teaching, this Jewish theology has been considered as later than the NT and formed precisely as a Jewish reaction to NT and patristic teaching on the atonement !!

Thus it is that at the present moment we have reached a critical stage in the study of the Targums in their relationship to the NT. On the one hand serious NT scholars are turning ever more to the Targums in their study of the NT message, while the relevance of the Targums and of the whole operation is being called into question by others.

#### 4. Criticism of Criticisms.

There is an age of criticism, so much so in fact that some are calling for the criticism of criticisms. In the Biblical field we are seeing the relevance of archaeological evidence for biblical research being called into question, for instance in the evaluation of the patriarchal traditions, and of the traditions relating to the Exodus and the settlement. The strengths and weaknesses of such established methods as Source and Form Criticism are queried. It is not in the least surprising that such a new science as that of targumic research should have its presuppositions, methods and conclusions called into question. In fact it is only good and proper that it should, since it is only by criticism that methodology is refined. Genuine criticism raises real problems. New sciences tend to make some sweeping assertions.

What, we may ask, is likely to be the outcome of this criticism with regard to the value of the Targums for NT studies? Will it be shown, or has it been shown, that the targumic tradition, and that of the Palestinian Targum in particular, is too recent to be used prudently in this research? Is the Aramaic of the Palestinian Targum definitely post 200 AD?

I do not think that the ground gained by this recent targumic research will so easily be shown to be irrelevant. The arguments in favour of the antiquity of the tradition are too strong for this. The evidence with regard to individual instances of a relationship, the Aqedah tradition for instance, will have to be seriously evaluated to see whether we can show that Jewish tradition is really dependent on Christian teaching, not vice versa. This is work

that must go ahead, but scarcely calls for suspension of judgement on the relevance of the Targums, and of the Palestinian Targum in particular, for NT study. There is one important truth, however, that these new criticisms point up, and that is that the methodology to be employed in the use of targumic evidence in NT research needs to be further studied and refined. This is a matter to which I intend to return at a later date.

## Notes

1. In 1967 the Biblical Institute Press, Rome, published a small booklet, entitled: Targum and New Testament (A Bibliography together with a NT Index.) Fourteen pages were devoted to the bibliography of writings on the subject and the remainder ( 74 pages ) to the index of NT passages studied in these writings. The author was Peter Nichols, O.F.M.Conv.

In 1972 Bernard Grossfield's ' A Bibliography of Targum Literature' ( Concinnati / NYork ) appeared, with 1054 entries. In 1977 a second volume of Grossfield's work was published, bringing the number of entries to 1852. Grossfield felt the need for this second volume because of the deficiencies of his first attempt and the continued growth in this particular field of study. Others besides Grossfield himself had noted the deficiencies of his first edition and his bibliography was supplemented by such Targum scholars as Michael Klein ( in Biblica 55, 1974, 281-285 ) and Alexandro Diez Macho, M.S.C. ( 1974 ).

In 1974 another authority in Targum studies, Roger Le Déaut, C.S.Sp. contributed two major studies on the subject: "The Current State of Targumic Studies" and " Targumic Literature and NT Interpretation", both in Biblical Theology Bulletin (Vol.4, 1974, 3-32 and 243-289). The essays represent papers delivered to the Society of Biblical Literature, evidence of the interest of this learned Society in this new branch of study. Still in 1974 a special publication in this field was begun, intended to keep interested scholars abreast of the research being published and in progress in this branch of learning. It was the Newsletter for Targum Studies, edited in Victoria College, Toronto.

In the entry on "Targums" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume (1976 ), and to a lesser extent in the supplement to the second printing of The NT

and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1978 ), the present writer gave a review of recent studies on the Targums, concentrating on trends and likely future directions.

The continuing interest in this new field of research is clear from the entries in the Newsletter for Targum Studies and in Elenchus Bibliographicus of the quarterly Biblica, edited by Peter Nöber and published by the Biblical Institute, Rome.

2. All these Targums have been available in print for some centuries before 1930, and were all provided with Latin translations. Some of them had English translations, as for instance all the known texts of the Targums of the Pentateuch which had been translated by J.W.Etheridge ( London, 1862, 1865 ). With the exceptions of the Targums of the books of Chronicles, all the texts had been printed, together with Latin translations, in Walton's London Polyglot Bible ( 1653-1657 ). Only at a later date did manuscripts of the Targums of Chronicles become known. These were published respectively by M.F.Beck and D.Wilkens in 1680 and 1715. Later more easily accessible Aramaic texts of the Targums were made available, notably that of Onkelos, edited by A.Berliner ( 1884 ) and those of the Prophets and Hagiographa by P.de Lagarde in 1872 and 1873 respectively.

Since the beginning of the Golden Age of Jewish Studies in 1850, quite an amount of research has been done in Jewish tradition, including the Targums. The Aramaic of Palestinian sources and of the Targums had also been studied and a grammar produced by G.Dalman: Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch ( 1894; 2nd ed. 1905 ). The bearing of the Targums on the study of the NT also received attention.

3. These were published by Paul Kahle in 1930 in his monumental work Masoreten des Westens II. Das paläst-inische Pentateuchtargum. Die paläst-inische Punktation. Der Bibeltext des Ben Naftali. Kahle published fragments from six different mss of the Palestinian Targum.

4....and of such Palestinian ( and Galilean ) texts as the Aramaic sections of the Palestinian Talmud and Misrashim.

5. Two years previously Stanislaus Lyonnet of the Biblical Institute, Rome had written on the importance of the targumic paraphrase of Deuteronomy 30:12-14 for an understanding of Romans 10:6-8. In Paris Pierre Grelot was devoting his



attention to the same question, In the early sixties Roger Le Déaut was beginning to produce the first of his many contributions on the subject. His doctoral thesis, La nuit pascalle. Essais sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42 (Rome, 1963) was the first major monograph on the subject in modern times. From the mid-sixties right down to our own day studies of the kind Kahle would have desired have come in rather rapid succession. The pace has accelerated particularly during the past decade.

6. The text of Neofiti was published in five volumes between 1968 (Genesis) and 1978 (Deuteronomy), together with Spanish, French and English translations and with extensive introductions by the editor (A. Diez Macho), introductions with an indication of recent writings on the subject. The same editor is also producing a critical edition of all the Targums. The first volume with the Palestinian Targum of Numbers (Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan, Geniza texts, Fragment Targum, with a Spanish translation of Pseudo-Jonathan) has already appeared as part of the Madrid Polyglot (Biblia Polyglotta Matritensis, Madrid, 1977). Other editions of the Targums have also been made.

Grammars of Neofiti have also been written, but as yet for the most part have been unpublished. Studies too have been made of the age to be assigned to the form of Aramaic found in the Palestinian Targum.

"They believed Philip preaching"(Acts 8.12) /1

E.A.Russell

The account of the mission of the early church to Samaria (Acts 8.4-34 ) is one of the most puzzling in the NT./2 It is given in two stages, the visit of Philip (4-13 ), then of the apostles, Peter and John. These two stages are variously interpreted whether of baptism and confirmation or of conversion and baptism with the Holy Spirit. /3 Dr Dunn in a recent book on "Baptism in the Holy Spirit" has suggested some reasons for claiming that the faith of the Samaritans in response to Philip was defective and that Luke intended his readers to know this./4 This paper is mainly concerned with two of the reasons:

1. That relating to the message brought by Philip;
2. That relating to their faith.

1. That relating to the message brought by Philip. It is claimed that the Samaritans understood the message in terms of their own expectation of the Messiah and the coming kingdom. /5 Such a Messiah was to overcome their foes and exalt the Samaritans, and it was this 'Ta'eb' or 'Restorer' that Philip proclaimed. The misunderstanding, it is claimed, was explicable in the atmosphere of excitement that Simon Magus had aroused. Such an atmosphere affected the response to Philip and their submission to baptism as a rite of entry into their kingdom.

It is claimed that Luke by the phrases he uses for Philip's message is encouraging this view, i.e., 'Ho Christos'(The Christ) simpliciter, and the phrase 'He basileia (The kingdom) tou theou(of God)'. In Acts according to Dr Dunn 'ho christos' simpliciter is always used of the pre-Christian experience, /6 while 'kingdom of God' as proclaimed to non-Christians refers to the kingdom of Jewish expectations. This is a strange claim, almost as if one were to say the Christian message from a certain slant could be seen as Jewish. The verses that contain the main account of Philip's ministry (5-8) are a summary in general

terms /7 and such a summary does not lead us to expect subtle nuances. Sufficient attention is not given to the context of the account- the proclamation of the word(8.4) i.e whatever the variation in expression in these verses, it represents the word proclaimed. The 'word' is a summary of Peter's kerygmatic speech on the day of Pentecost which when accepted brings about conversion(2.41). It is the special task of the apostles to give themselves to the preaching of the 'word of God'(6.2). That both the phrases 'the Christ' and the 'kingdom of God' are within this context of preaching the word suggests that they too are kerygmatic in the full sense.

This view is confirmed by the use of 'ho Christos' simpliciter in other references that are given e.g., it is used of 'the Christ' who was to suffer( 3.18; 17.3) or who rose from the dead (2.31) i.e., it is thoroughly kerygmatic, not Jewish. Later Philip preaches 'Jesus' as the fulfilment of prophecies pointing to a suffering Christ (8.35). It would be natural to assume that 'the Christ' proclaimed by Philip was not pre-Christian but fully christian in the sense that in response to such proclamation people come to believe (cf 3.18 and 4.4). The argument that applies<sup>to</sup> the phrase 'the Christ' also applies to the 'kingdom of God' (8.12) i.e., that it is in the context of the proclamation of the word, and should be entirely consonant with that. It should further be noted that it does not stand by itself. The full phrase runs, 'good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.' The combination of 'kingdom' and 'Jesus' as Conzelmann points out.

/8 is the Lucan way of describing the content of the proclamation. It is parallel to the content of Paul's proclamation at Rome where we find him 'preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ.'( 28.31) Are we to apply the interpretation of such a kingdom as being that of Jewish expectation to both places? Or is it not more convincing to see the kingdom of God as Burchard points out as kerygmatic in Acts? /9 To single out the phrase 'the Christ' and 'the kingdom of God' as pre-



christian and ignore the phrases the 'word' and the 'name of Jesus' is too subtle a refinement of the narrative of Luke if our argument is correct.

2. The second reason offered for suggesting that the response of the Samaritans was defective relates to the nature of their faith.

In the story we have two responses of the Samaritans, one to Simon and the other to Philip.

/ 10 Dr Dunn suggests that the response to Simon was one that showed 'little discernment and depth',

/11 a movement of the mob caught up in a wave of emotion. This response is bound up with that to Philip by the use of the same verb 'prosecho'. It can mean here with 'ton noun' ( 'the mind') understood, 'pay attention'. /12 So the same sort of attention is given to Philip as to Simon ie something superficial and shallow. How valid is this equation however? It should be said to begin with that the use of terms like 'herd instinct' or 'wave of emotion' sounds strange within the Lucan presentation. Luke is rather concerned to underline the impact of Simon's ministry e.g., amazement (9, 11), wholesale attention (10, 11) and over against it the triumph of the proclamation of Philip. This would suggest that the response to Philip was of a more vital kind, and this is confirmed by his use of the word 'believe'. (pisteuo) in relation to the word proclaimed by Philip (8.12). 'Believe' is the normal term for the Christian response.

Luke is careful to make a distinction that is important between his uses of 'prosecho'. It relates to the subject of the attention. The Samaritans give heed to the man Simon (10, 11), the magician (9,11) but in Philip's case they give heed to the message he proclaims (6, 12) i.e., the concentration of attention is on the good news proclaimed. It is contrasted with the source of Simon's power i.e., his magic. That paying attention to the word proclaimed can bring about discipleship is given striking confirmation in the story of Lydia: "The Lord opened her heart to give heed to what was said by Paul" (16.14) /13 Do we not need to distinguish the rich response of Lydia from that of the Samaritans?

Before proceeding to look at the nature of the faith implied here, there is one other point brought in to support a mass movement of unthinking people and that is 'homothumadon' ('with one accord') (vs 6), 'the multitudes with one accord gave heed to what was said by Philip.' /14 According to Haenchen, Luke uses the term to describe the ideal unity of the community and applies it to the Samaritans in their united response here. /15 It is used of the united action of a group whether in prayer ( 1.14; 4.24; cf 2.46 ) or in decision in the council ( 15.25) or of an angry mob (7.57; 18.12; 19.29 ). The stress here would appear to be on the unity in eager and glad response.

We turn now finally to look at the terms in which faith is described: 'When they believed Philip as he preached the good news.' ( 8.12 'Hote de episteusan to Philippo euangelizomeno ' ) Dr Dunn is not prepared to concede that Luke means by the use of 'episteusan' ( 'believed' ) here a full and valid faith. Rather in his view this is found when the verb is used with the preposition 'epi' or 'eis' followed by the accusative of the person believed in e.g., 'Lord' or 'Lord Jesus Christ.' Here it is used with the dative and, he claims, signifies 'intellectual assent to a statement or proposition' and is paralleled in the phrase elsewhere in Acts of 'believing in the prophets' (cf 26.27 'pisteueis tois prophetais'; 24.14)

Our first reaction is to wonder whether in Acts there is such a refinement in the understanding of faith as 'intellectual assent to a proposition' in the realm of soteriology. But can we distinguish the use of 'pisteuo' in this way in Luke? In the context the word is proclaimed whether it is described in phrases like 'the Christ' or 'the kingdom' or the 'name of Christ'. The response to this is given in terms of faith and it is faith not in 'Philip' but in 'Philip-proclaiming-the-good news' i.e., it is response to the good news.

It is questionable however if the distinction between 'pisteuo' with the dative and 'pisteuo eis' or

'epi' with the accusative can be maintained. /16 If we take the use of 'pisteuo' with the object 'kurios' (Lord), we find it can be expressed in Acts in three ways either with the preposition 'epi' ('Many believed in the Lord'; 9.42 ) or with 'eis' ('The Lord in whom they believed'; 14.23 ) or simply with the dative. ('Those who believe in the Lord'; 5.14; cf 18.8). There appears to be no difference in the meaning attached to 'pisteuo'. In every case it is the decisive committal of the Christian. When 'pisteuo' is used of trust or reliance on the scriptures whether the law or the prophets, it can take the dative (24.14. 26.27 ) or be joined by 'epi'. It is clear that if Paul says to the Philippian jailer 'Believe on ('epi') the Lord Jesus Christ and you will be saved' (16.31 ), it is no mere intellectual assent. As far as Luke is concerned it is full committal. Yet he can use the same combination of verb and preposition ('epi') for belief in scripture. The claim therefore that it is mere intellectual assent in 8.12 does not seem in accord with the linguistic situation in Acts.

As further evidence of the shallowness of the Samaritans' faith, Dr Dunn puts it parallel to the faith of Simon Magus. /17 It is said of him that 'he believed' ('episteusen') and was baptised' (8.13). This is interpreted that 'he had never become a member of the people of God' /18 and based on the words of indictment of Peter, 'you have neither part nor lot in this matter'. (vs 21). Peter's words however refer to Simon's attempt to buy the gift of the Holy Spirit with money. According to Haenchen /19 supported by Lampe /20, the formula which is taken from the LXX is a formula of excommunication. If this is the case, then up to this point Simon has been a member of the believing community. This is confirmed by the use of 'pisteuo' in the absolute form without an object. It is said simply that 'Simon believed' ('episteusen'). Elsewhere in Acts such an absolute use applies to the believing community e.g., 'those who believed' ('hoi pisteusantes' ) (2.44 ), the 5000 converts ('episteusan' 4.4) i.e., it is understood



as effective faith ( cf also 11.21; 15.5). If as the context suggests Luke is emphasising the impact of Philip's ministry over against that of Simon, this would support a valid faith. /21 It is assumed because of the expression of Simon's life that he is not a Christian. Yet it is interesting that in Acts Luke seldom mentions the necessity of faith finding its validation in works. He never uses the word 'fruit' ('karpos') and only on one occasion does he use the phrase in Paul's speech of 'works ('erga') fit for repentance' ( 26.20). His interest is in the witness of the church (1.8) proclaiming the word and the response is described in a stylistic variation of the word 'pisteuo'. Unlike Ananias and Sapphira, members of the believing community ( 5.1-11) Simon has the possibility of repentance of his desire to buy the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is interesting that he resembles Ananias and Sapphira in that his judgment is in relation to material matters and to the Holy Spirit.

To conclude then: whatever may be the explanation of the two accounts linked together in the account of the mission to Samaria in Acts, it does appear that to suggest the faith of the Samaritans in response to Philip's preaching of the good news was defective does not represent the Lucan view.

### Notes

1. This short essay arose out of a seminar on the charismatic movement and the NT in the Presbyterian College over a period of two years where among other books that of Dr J.D.G.Dunn on 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit' (London, 1970) was studied with great profit. The essay was delivered at the International Bible Congress in Oxford in 1973 and is here published essentially as given along with Dr Dunn's reply. We are grateful to him for consenting to reply.
2. For the discussion cf E.Preuschen, Apostelgeschichte, (Tübingen, 1912 ) p 50 (he considers the separation of water baptism and that of the Holy Spirit

as opposing the view of the early church); Wendt (H.H.), Apostelgeschichte, (Göttingen, 1913), p.153 N.2; K.Bornhäuser, Studien zur Apostelgeschichte, (Gütersloh, 1914), pp 89-93; M.Dibelius, Studies in Acts, (London, 1956), p.194; C.S.C.Williams, Acts, (London, 1957), pp 118-120; E.Haenchen, Apostelgeschichte, (Göttingen, 1961), pp 256-259; F.F.Bruce, Acts, (London, 1962), pp 181-183; H. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, (Tübingen, 1963) pp 53-55; G.Stählin, Apostelgeschichte, (Göttingen, 1966), p.123; G.W.H.Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, (London, 1967), p.66ff

N.3: Cf J.D.G.Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, (London, 1970), Ch.5 for a thorough look at the problem.

N.4: op.cit., p.63ff

N.5: op.cit., p.63f; also J.Macdonald, Theology of the Samaritans, (London, 1964), pp.362-371 (on Ta'eb)

N.6: References in Acts are 2.31, 36; 3.18; 4.26; 9.22; 17.3; 26.23.

N.7: Cf M.Dibelius, op.cit. p.17, N.34

N.8: H.Conzelmann, op.cit., p.54 (on 8.12 'der Inhalt der Predigt ist in seiner (Lukas) Diktion gegeben')

N.9: C.Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge (Göttingen, 1970), p.141: 'In der Apostelgeschichte nennt Lukas die Basileia als Kerygma'. Cf K.L.Schmidt, TDNT, Vol.1, p.583(b)

N.10: The account of Simon should precede that of Philip. For the problem see the literature cited.

N.11: op.cit., p.64; on the 'superstitious people' (sic), the Samaritans, cf the discussion in Macdonald, op.cit., pp.22-24; cf also p.389 on the absence of belief in Satanic power.

N.12: For the various uses of the word cf. W.F.Arndt and F.W.Gingrich, Greek English Lexicon of the NT etc., (Cambridge, 1957) p.721; it occurs in Acts: 5. 35; 8.6, 10, 11; 16.14; 20.28.

N.13: This is the only place where such a parallel phrase appears in Acts.

N.14: References are 1.14; 2.46; 4.24; 5.12; 7.57; 8.6; 12.20; 15.25; 18.12; 19.29; Romans 15.6.

N.15: op.cit., p.120; cf Heidland, TDNT, Vol IV, p.86 where in reference to 8.6 he speaks of the 'inner unity of the community....listening to apostolic teaching'.

N.16: Cf Bultmann, TDNT, Vol VI, p.203ff

N.17: op.cit.,p.65

N.18: ibid

N.19: op.cit.p.255.

N.20: Lampe, New Peake Commentary, (London,1962),ad loc.

N.21: Haenchen, op.cit.,p.254; cf however Stählin, op.cit., p.121 who claims that Simon's faith was not a valid faith; cf also Wendt, op.cit.,p.157; Bruce,op.cit.,p.179.



## "They believed Philip preaching" (Acts 8.12): A REPLY /1

James D.G.Dunn

I am grateful to Professor Russell for his comments on a small but important part of my thesis in Baptism in the Holy Spirit, and for the careful attention he has given to the considerations I marshalled at that point. I readily admit that this was not the strongest part of my discussion of Acts, and that if my interpretation of Luke's intention is correct, Luke could have made his meaning a good deal clearer. But I was driven to search for an alternative explanation by the unsatisfactory nature of the other interpretations offered for what all are agreed is a rather difficult passage which raises several puzzling questions.

The question which has posed the greatest puzzles for successive generations of commentators is the relation between faith, baptism and the gift of the Spirit in Acts 8: "the Samaritans believed Philip preaching concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ and were baptized", but by the time of Peter and John's visit the Spirit "had not yet fallen on any one of them, they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8. 12, 16). Three factors have become increasingly clear to me since I began my research into such questions nearly fifteen years ago and there continue to determine for me the parameters within which the interpretation of the Samaritan incident must be found:

1) Luke clearly thought that the Spirit had not been given to the Samaritans before Peter and John laid their hands on them. It cannot successfully be argued that Luke thought of the (already received) Spirit now merely making his presence known in visible manifestation, for it is clear enough from the rest of Luke's writings that this is the way he conceptualized the Spirit as a tangible power whose impact on an individual or group is as much physical as anything else. /1 Indeed, he never thinks of the Spirit being given in any other terms- whether to Jesus ("descending in bodily form as a dove"- Luke 3.22), or to the first disciples ("a sound like the roar of a mighty wind...tongues like fire ...they began to speak in other tongues"- Acts 2. 2-4),

to Cornelius and his friends (Peter and the others knew that the Spirit had been poured out on them "for they heard them speaking in tongues and magnifying God"- Acts 10.45-6), and to the Ephesian 'disciples' ("They spoke in tongues and prophesied"- Acts 19.6). The question in Acts 19.2, "Did you receive the Spirit when you believed?" obviously presumes that those who received the Spirit would know it, and not just as a deduction drawn from the fact that they had believed (whether they had experienced anything or not). So it is not surprising when we read Acts 2.33- Jesus "having been exalted to the right hand of God received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father and poured out this which you see and hear"-where the gift of the Spirit is actually described as the ecstatic behaviour and glossolalia of the disciples on the day of Pentecost.

So too in Acts 8.18 - Simon saw what happened to the Samaritans when Peter and John laid hands on them; that is, "he saw that the Spirit was being given through the laying on of the apostles' hands". In other words, Luke's presentation of the gift of the Spirit in Acts 8 is wholly of a piece with his understanding of what was involved elsewhere in his writings. In his mind the Spirit had not come to the Samaritan believers before Peter and John's visit. And it was his intention to convey precisely this fact- "the Spirit had not yet fallen on any of them, they had only been baptized...." /2

2) Luke shared the regular view among the major NT writers that it is the gift of the Spirit which constitutes a Christian.

In some ways this is a more controversial claim, but I think it can be sustained. For other writers we need think merely of Romans 8.9 - "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his"; 1 Corinthians 12.13 - "in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body... and we were all drenched with one Spirit"; /3 Galatians 3. 6-14 - "the promise of the Spirit" is "the blessing of Abraham" is "justification by faith"; John 7.37-39 - "Jesus said, 'If anyone thirsts, let him come to me; and let him drink, he who believes in me. As the Scripture said, Rivers of living water will flow from him'. /4 This he said concerning the Spirit which those who believed in him would receive"; 1 John 4.13 - "By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given /5

us to share in his Spirit".

For Acts the same viewpoint emerges from a consideration of the other two of his conversion narratives where the gift of the Spirit is specifically recorded. According to Acts 10.43-47 and 11.14-18 the Spirit fell upon Cornelius and his friends just at the point where Peter had explained God's offer of forgiveness and salvation. Peter concludes from seeing the Spirit thus given that God had thereby accepted them - "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God?" (11.17) Clearly here the gift of the Spirit is synonymous with, or the Spirit is the bearer of, forgiveness, salvation and life (11.18); the gift of the Spirit was understood to have embodied that acceptance by God, to have established that relationship with God which is what conversion, justification etc., are all about. So too Acts 19.2. When Paul met a group who evidently claimed to be 'believers', /6 but just as clearly were lacking in that visibly manifested Spirit, the question he put was the decisive one which would tell whether they were indeed believers in Christ or not- "Did you receive the Spirit when you believed?", or as we might justly paraphrase, "You say you are believers, but did you receive the Spirit when you made this commitment that you speak of.?" We could even include the only other episode where Luke describes the gift of the Spirit to a group - Pentecost itself; for Acts 11.17 describes that too in terms of conversion - Cornelius has received the Spirit just as we received the Spirit "when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ".

In short, in every other case (leaving aside Acts 8) it is clear enough that the gift of the Spirit was for Luke what marked out those who believed in Christ. Like Paul and John Luke was firmly of the view that it is the gift of the Spirit whereby God accepts a man, the Spirit thus given which makes a man a Christian.

3) Luke also shared the regular view among NT writers that the Spirit was given to faith.

When a man believed in Christ he received the Spirit from God through Christ. Again, so far as the other major NT writers are concerned, we need simply think of Galatians 3.2-3 - "Did you receive the Spirit by works of law or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun with



with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh?" As for John we need simply recall John 7.39 - "This he said concerning the Spirit which those who believed in him would receive". Acts is if anything clearer on this point. We have already quoted 11.17 - the Spirit is the gift given by God to individuals when they believe in, commit themselves to the Lord Jesus Christ - said with reference both to Cornelius and his friends and to the first disciples at Pentecost. In the other reference to the conversion of Cornelius Peter describes it thus - "God gave the Holy Spirit to them as he had to us, and made no discrimination between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith" (15.8-9) - where the gift of the Spirit and "cleansing their hearts by faith" are clearly alternative descriptions of the same event (cf 11.15-18). Paul's question to the Ephesian 'disciples' in 19.2 reveals the same association in Luke's mind (and Paul's) between the gift of the Spirit and that step of commitment by which Luke regularly denotes conversion /7 - "Did you receive the Spirit when you believed?" - the implication being that if they had believed, taken the step of commitment, they would have received the Spirit.

Thus three things seem to be clear when we try to reconstruct the context of Luke's thought and understanding within which we must seek after the meaning he intended to convey in his narrative in Acts 8.4-24: Luke believed that the gift of the Spirit was the central element in conversion-initiation - without the Spirit the individual could not be said to be accepted by God, to have received God's forgiveness and salvation; Luke's understanding was that the Spirit was given when the individual believed, committed himself to Jesus as Lord; but so far as the Samaritans were concerned, they did not receive the Spirit until a lengthy period had elapsed after their baptism.

The question remaining to us therefore is how Luke would have understood this situation, how he would have intended his readers to understand it. We could argue that Luke saw the Samaritans as a special case - the antagonism between Jew and Samaritan being well known (cf Luke 9.52-56; 10.30-37). But there is no hint of that in the narrative, and while it is not implausible in itself, as an explanation it has to be imported entirely into the passage. We might alternatively argue that Luke had no view of the question, that it was not a question for him; he simply recorded faithfully what his sources narrated. But while this is by no means impossible, it does not altogether square with the

clear message and emphasis which seems to be at the heart of the accounts of Cornelius and the Ephesians in Acts 10-11 and 19.1-6, on the centrality of the gift of the Spirit in these cases. In view of the prominence of the Spirit in Luke's own thinking /8 it is hardly likely that Luke had no interpretation of the events he recorded in Acts 8.

If we may presume therefore that Luke tried to make some theological sense of the Samaritan episode, what was it? The merit of my own suggestion, if I may be so bold, was that it drew attention to several hints in the account itself which pointed to an answer, and one which is in complete accord with the three basic elements in Luke's thinking to which we have already drawn attention. That Luke could have drawn out these hints more clearly is an inadequate answer, since other explanations do not even have hints to build on. Nor will it do to question whether Luke was capable of sophisticated allusions and refined nuances - Luke could produce a very elegant style when he wanted and his theological capacity has been clearly highlighted since the advent of so-called 'redaction criticism'. /9

The clearest of these hints is that relating to the Samaritans' faith, to which Professor Russell devoted much of his paper. Here the key point is Luke's description of their faith - 'they believed Philip....'. The distinction between pisteuein with the dative and pisteuein eis with the accusative is well known in biblical Greek, the former denoting belief about, belief that ( intellectual assent to what another says), the latter denoting belief into, commitment to the person named. / 10 Now it is true that Luke uses the dative construction in some instances where we might have expected the eis with accusative construction ( 16.34 - "believed in God"; 18.8 - "believed in the Lord"). /11 But he also uses the dative construction to denote intellectual assent in 24.14 and 26.27. And, more important, he never elsewhere describes commitment by pisteuein with the dative of the person who proclaimed the Gospel. This construction would, after all, be quite inadequate to describe that commitment to the Lord which was what mattered. The act of commitment by which individuals became 'believers' is never simply belief in what someone else said about the Lord; be it Peter or Paul or Philip, but commitment to

the Lord himself. This wholly unique description in 8.12 is only a hint, to be sure, but it is a hint, and when Luke has given no other indication of his intended meaning we must accept what hints he has thrown out. That is to say, in this case we must assume that the uniqueness of his construction in 8.12 is not accidental, but a deliberate clue which the observant reader asking the right questions (about the importance of the Spirit and faith) would observe and read aright.

The implication then is that Luke understood the Samaritans' faith to be defective to some degree. This hint is confirmed first by the news that Simon also 'believed', once we read it in the light which the sequel throws in the character of Simon (8.18-23); and second by the news that none of the Samaritans received the Spirit at that time, which would indicate, in view of the faith-Spirit link, that their faith had been defective.

These are the principal hints to the meaning that Luke would have intended. The further considerations which I marshalled in Baptism, most of which Professor Russell discusses in the first part of his paper, are possible pointers to the explanation of the events at the historical level, if we may assume for the present purposes that Luke's account is strictly historical. If the Samaritans did indeed respond warmly to Philip's message, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and yet did not receive the Spirit, then what was the historical explanation? Luke suggests their faith was defective. How could that be? The answer may be simply that they were a people of a rather volatile sentiment who misinterpreted Philip's preaching and whose response therefore was wrongly directed. Luke does not help us much, if at all on this question. But his description of the Samaritans and of Philip's message is certainly consistent with such an explanation and may well point in that direction. At this point Professor Russell suggests that I imply that 'the Christian message from a certain slant could be seen as Jewish' (above p.xx 2 in ms). I find this comment odd since of course the Christian message was in a very important sense and to a very important degree 'Jewish', concerning the Messiah of Jewish expectation - that Jesus was he. My point is not that Philip's preaching was sub-Christian or pre-Christian, but that in the Samaritan context it could have been understood in a way that Philip had not entirely intended, in a way that nobody else



understood it, since the Samaritan context was so distinctive.

With this restatement I rest my case. Fuller treatment of particular points, especially those in the preceding paragraph will be found in Baptism. The explanation is not as compelling as I would wish, but when Luke has left us only 'a few clues as to his meaning in this very compressed passage, we have to be content with those he did provide. Despite Professor Russell's criticisms I would still wish to maintain that my interpretation of Luke's meaning makes the best sense of what he has actually written, and best accords with his theology of conversion-initiation insofar as that comes to expression elsewhere in Acts. It also gives a plausible explanation of the historical episode itself( if Luke's account is accurate), which is consistent with the historical context of the time and with Luke's actual description. Can any alternative explanation claim as much?

### Notes

1. That it is a Lukan tendency to think of spiritual phenomena in concrete, tangible terms is demonstrated in Jesus and the Spirit, SCM Press 1975, pp.121ff,190
2. I have shown the equivalence of the various verbs which Luke uses to describe the gift of the Spirit in Baptism pp.70-72.
3. Note the vigorous metaphors like those used by Luke
4. That is, from Jesus to the believer - cf.4.14, 19.34; 20.22; see Baptism pp.179f.
5. The tense denotes an action in the past whose effect continues in the present.
6. See Baptism pp.84f
7. cf.2.44;4.32;9.42;11.17;13.12,48; 14.1,23,etc
8. E.g.,cf.Luke 4.1,14,18;10.21 and 11.13 with parallel passages in the other Gospels
9. Professor Russell himself argues that"Luke is careful to make a distinction that is important between his uses of prosecho " (above p.xx ms.p.4)
10. See Arndt & Gingrich, Gk-English Lexicon of NT,pisteuein
11. 5.14 is disputed; RSV translates,"More than ever believers were added to the Lord".

Wissa Balasuriya: The Eucharist and Human Liberation  
SCM Press Ltd, 1979 £2.95

This volume is an attempt to look at the Eucharist in the light of liberation theology. More than that, the author believes that a proper celebration is bound to be a springboard for a gospel which is truly liberating for the whole of society.

His main thesis is that there has been a domestication of the Eucharist through the medieval and colonial periods of the past and this was associated with the suppression of the political dimension of the gospel. Speaking out of the Roman Catholic tradition he is deeply critical of the Liturgical reforms since Vatican II which have still concentrated largely on marginal issues.

His main contention is that it should not be possible to participate in the Eucharist, where the heart of the whole rite is "sharing", without recognizing the radical implications of this for our total life sharing and the challenge to overcome the injustices in society. In a historical sketch he traces the path by which the Sacrament has been privatized and clericalised.

A true recovery of the celebration of the Eucharist would make it impossible for Christians to uphold sex, class or colour divisions and it would lead to a freeing of the churches from their links with world power establishments. The author writes from the background of Sri Lanka and from a situation where there is an ongoing dialogue between radical Christian and Marxist groups. One senses a deep search for the recovery of authentic Christian community with appropriate structures in which the full depths of sharing in the Eucharist will sustain the struggle to create a new society.

This highly political theology has arisen as a protest against pietism, quietism, worldly conservatism and obscurantism in the churches. Many of the points made are very challenging and worthy of close attention but the picture of Jesus which emerges seems to miss out something important.

Is it the whole truth to say that "Jesus was killed because he took an unflinching stand against injustice, deception and exploitation of the poor and the weak"? What was the nature of the freedom which he offered to men and

women? There is no doubt that it was subversive to those who sought to maintain the status quo, but it was different from the freedom advocated by the zealots.

I am sure that the recovery of a more authentic Christian community and a right celebration of the Eucharist will go hand in hand. Also Christians must participate in the struggles of today and these must have political dimensions. But unless this struggle leads us into a deeper understanding of Christ's suffering and of the freedom of which his resurrection is the effective sign we will not have a message which is really good news for mankind.

The Presbyterian Community Centre,  
Belfast

J.W.Morrow

Walther Zimmerli: Old Testament Theology in Outline

T. & T. Clark Ltd, 1978 pp 258 £5.80

The basic problem of OT theology is whether there is such a thing. To be sure, the OT contains theological ideas and it is certainly possible to identify and describe 'the theology' of particular parts of it, but the question is whether all such data can be added together to produce in sum a coherent and consistent structure and, supposing this is possible, what the result would represent.

Would it be the theology of ancient Israel? Hardly, for although Zimmerli, in a presumably unguarded moment, refers (p.238) to the OT as Israel's "canonical scriptures", that is one thing the OT is not. It is the canonical scripture of Rabbinic Judaism and, in conjunction with the NT, of the Christian church, but it cannot stand by itself as encompassing the theology of either party and, inasmuch as it received its canonical status at the hand of the former group, it is doubtful whether it can be taken as a unit to represent the outlook of any early body.

The difficulty in identifying an owner, as it were, for the theology of the OT does not, however, preclude the possibility of such an entity existing. It ought, after all, be possible to assemble all the theological ideas of the entire corpus and label the resulting collection "OT theology", but it should not be expected, in view of the nature of the OT as a collection of material of diverse origin, that this will produce a coherent and consistent statement of belief.



The lack of consistency within the OT is clearly displayed in the early pages of Zimmerli's book when he raises the question, "How does the faith of the OT come by its knowledge of the name of its God?", and provides the twin answers of the Pentateuch, that it was first revealed to Moses in the course of preparations for the exodus and that it was known to the ancestors of the Israelites from the beginning of human history. Of these two views the former finds more frequent expression in the OT than does the latter and Zimmerli himself seems to prefer it as somehow more important than the other. In the introductory section designated "Approach" he observes that the tradition of the revelation of the name Yahweh to Moses obviously preserves the correct recollection that there can be no talk of the Yahweh of the OT until he reveals himself as the God of Israel and accomplishes the deliverance of Israel from Egypt". But this observation displays an historical outlook which is surely out of place in the sphere of theology. Whatever the historian may decide was the origin of the name and worship of Yahweh, the tradition that the name was known from the creation of the world is no less a part of OT theology than the tradition that it was not. Even in a historical sense, while it is true that there can be no talk of a God of Israel in a period before there was an Israel for him to be a God of, it does not necessarily follow that there can be, as Zimmerli puts it, no talk of the Yahweh of the OT" in that period.

Still in the same connection, there is a surprising statement on p.22, made with reference to Hosea 13.4, that even more clearly than the beginning of the Decalogue it underlies the fact that this "God of Israel" is a relationship that has existed from the beginning of time, in the sense, for instance, that the Babylon god Shamash was the sun god by definition." Quite apart from the idiocy of saying that the God of Israel is a relationship (for which I know not whether the author or translator is to blame), Hosea 13.4 does nothing of the kind, unless the beginning of time is to be located at the date of the exodus. In charity one might suppose that the word 'not' has been omitted accidentally either from before the word 'existed' or from after the word 'is'. If one of these verbs were negated the sentence would read more satisfactorily, but this raises the rather disconcerting possibility that at many places in the book, the author may have intended to say the direct opposite of what is printed on its pages. The reader

must therefore be constantly on his guard.

The smooth flow of the text is disturbed for this reviewer by two features. One is the intrusion from time to time of American forms, not only the standard '-or' for '-our' spellings, or 'worshiper' (one who worships?) for 'worshipper', but also terms like the 'great fall festival', which requires a momentary pause in which to consider whether the reference is to a wrestling match or to the autumnal celebration of the New Year. (The description of the Pentateuch as having been 'monstrously expanded' (p.17) may belong to the same category, or it may be just bad English.)

The second feature which causes disturbance is the practice, where Hebrew words or phrases are cited, of including both Hebrew alphabet and transliterated forms, with the consequence that the reader finds himself reading these words or phrases twice over. What the point of having this duplication is, is not clear. The preface offers the explanation that "in order to introduce the reader unacquainted with Hebrew to the Hebrew conceptuality in its Hebrew dress, the (unvocalized) Hebrew words have also been cited in transliteration". It is perfectly reasonable that the reader who has no Hebrew should thus be enabled to read Hebrew words, but the Hebraist, too, can read Hebrew in transliteration and does not need to have it repeated in Hebrew letters. Indeed, with this book he often has to rely on the transliteration, for the Hebrew typography is execrable. Throughout the book, starting with the very first appearance of Hebrew type (on p.12, where the word tora (sic) appears in Hebrew letters as today), misprints abound. Often these stem from confusion of letters of similar shape (final mem, for example, is regularly found instead of samekh; in a few places this error has been visibly corrected by a samekh from a different font) but some are quite inexplicable (for example, the use in several places of the non-final form of kaph at the end of a word.)

It is always sad to see a ship spoiled for a ha'p'orth of tar. If Hebrew type had to be used, greater care should have been taken over its use. Without it (and, good or bad, it serves no useful purpose) the price of the book would presumably have been somewhat lower.

Charlotte Klein: Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology  
pp xi and 176 SPCK, 1978 £3.95

This is a passionate book. It is written out of a deep concern for Judaism especially in the light of the 'holocaust' which is only one horrific example of the injuries that have been inflicted on the Jewish people throughout centuries. The ideology of Nazi-ism did not emerge apart from the Church but was rooted in its teachings as is now generally recognized. Here in this book we have an entry into the writings mainly of German but also of French theologians to discover elements which might foster anti-semitic prejudice.

The book was first published in German under the title "Theologie und Anti-Judaismus" in 1975. It has justifiably been thought significant enough to warrant translation into English by the SPCK. Its impact is undeniable. Its method is to take out passages from theological writings in relation to certain sensitive areas in Jewish-Christian understanding, e.g., 'Law and Legalistic Piety' (pp.39-66), 'Pharisees and Sadducees' (pp.67-91), 'Jewish Guilt in the Death of Jesus' (pp.92-126), and to point out how such passages stem from, or contribute to, Anti-Judaism. The list of names is quite astonishing in its extent. It includes eminent experts on Judaism like Emil Schürer (whose history of Judaism in the last centuries has exercised a dominant influence on German students in particular since the start of the twentieth century) and Werner Foerster (whose book on the NT and Palestinian Judaism has for some time been a students' text-book); notable exegetes like Joachim Jeremias, Walther Grundmann, Marie-Joseph Lagrange; or more general theologians like Karl Barth, Helmut Stauffer or Dietrich Bonhoeffer (whose name may be familiar but is rather strange and perplexing in this connection).

Sister Klein's initial impulse was rooted here, in the discovery that the events of the last decades have made little difference to the way in which University teachers especially in Germany view the Jews and Judaism. Behind their instruction lie certain presuppositions which include the following: that Judaism has been superseded and replaced by Christianity; consequently Judaism has no right to exist; its teachings and ethical values are inferior to those of Christianity; the Christian theologian continues to assume that he has the right to pass judgement on Judaism, its destiny and its task in the world or to be per-



mitted to dictate this task (p.7).

Sister Klein is a nun of the Catholic Order of "Our Lady of Sion" whose work is mainly in the sphere of Jewish-Christian relations. She lectured in Germany in the years 1970, 1971, striving to give the students an objective view of Judaism in the period between the OT and the NT. Essays were set in connection with the series, including one on the misunderstanding of Jesus by his contemporaries. Such essays were very revealing, expressing a point of view and a disparagement of Jews and Judaism which could be traced back to Emil Schürer and his successors. It was salutary for Sister Klein to realize that such students would carry over into their ministry, whether as pastors or teachers, attitudes of this kind. Indeed one of the major problems, according to Sister Klein, lies here, in the unthinking acceptance of attitudes and an understanding of Judaism that belongs to the writers at the turn of the century without examining their presuppositions. She defines her work as a pilot project to stimulate further studies, "probing more deeply and offering answers to the charges that are levelled here".(p.14) The project is thoroughly to be commended and invites further research.

In the foreword, Father Gregory Baum rightly points out that the 'Holocaust' of Jews in Nazi Germany could not have taken place "if hostility to the Jews had not been fostered by Christian preaching which spoke of Jews and Judaism almost from the beginning only in terms of rejection".(p.ix). The difficulty which he himself recognizes is that anti-Jewish ideology can find its roots in the NT or at least find its impetus there unless handled with sensitivity and understanding. This fact is perhaps not emphasized sufficiently by Sister Klein. It would seem fairly clear that if a wide range of scholars can be charged with similar distortions( and often in almost identical terms) e.g., in relation to Jewish legalism, or to Scribes and Pharisees, such apparent distortions may derive from the NT material, or at least from one line of interpretation of it. Again the difficulties of the material of the NT for interpretation tend to be over-simplified by Sister Klein in her presentation. It is not enough to put anti-Judaistic material down to the redactor and suggest it does not belong to the Jesus tradition. Indictment of the Scribes and Pharisees is found in the Marcan and Q sources while conflict( pace Klein p.92) belongs to the earliest tradition and is not necessarily redaction.

Again Sister Klein rightly attacks the approach which indicts the whole of Judaism in relation to the death of Jesus. Yet this kind of group indictment belongs to some of the NT accounts, e.g., Peter declares to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, "You killed him by letting sinful men crucify him" ( Acts 2.23); or at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, Peter tells the 'whole people', " you killed the one who leads to life." ( Acts 3.15 TEV). Again in Matthew's Gospel, it is difficult to resist the interpretation of Jesus' parable that the whole people of Israel is rejected when we read, " And so I tell you", added Jesus, "the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who will produce the proper fruits." ( Matthew 21.43; many commentators consider this statement redactional however). It is, however, incorrect to charge the whole of Judaism with putting Jesus to death. In Mark's Gospel (and parallels) the crowds in Galilee are consistently shown to be friendly to Jesus. Only the scribes and Pharisees are at this time represented as hostile to Jesus ( 2.1- 3.6). In Jerusalem, it is only the authorities ( and not all of these ?) and the mob influenced by them who bring about the death of Jesus. In the light, then, of the evidence of the Gospels, it becomes incredible to read of some of the tenuous interpretations which Sister Klein selects for us. Some examples may be cited.

A representative Catholic theologian, Michael Schmaus, in a standard and influential work on dogma writes: "The curse will accompany this people - reduced to a remnant - throughout history and will call down one judgement after another upon them, but one day it will come to an end." (p.108). What ground, we may ask, is there in the teaching of the NT to suggest that a whole people can suffer for the folly of a few and that throughout history? Especially if such a few did it in ignorance and Jesus expressed it in his prayer, "Forgive them, Father! They don't know what they're doing". ( Luke 23.34; cf. Acts 3.17). And in what respect is the sin of Judaism different from those who do not recognize the claims of Christ? Here we are faced with an all too prevalent interpretation of a sinister kind of the NT evidence. It is eminently desirable, in the light of the tragic lessons of history, that such form of teaching be discarded or have the misleading elements removed.

But not all such statements are made by theologians who all too often ignore exegetical principles). A German Catholic exegete, well-known for his fine commentary on

Galatians, Heinrich Schlier, has some severe statements in his work, 'Das Mysterium Israels'. There he speaks of the undercurrent of hostility running through the history of Israel and finally concentrated in deadly hatred against Christ. We might well ask why it should be expressed in this way. Why should such hostility be tied in to Israel? The Biblical View is that rebellion is at the root of sin and that all share in it. That the form of expression seems to be loaded is confirmed by what Schlier proceeds to say—that Israel (why not all rebels?) was thus consigned to a fate of homelessness where "the burden of God, the burden of his guilt, the burden of God's wrath, the burden of ineffable suffering, the burden of man's existence lie upon him." (pp. 109-110). Such a statement places the sin of Judaism in a category different from the rest of mankind. It cannot be unrelated to the view that the Jews committed deicide when they put Jesus to death as if any of the disciples let alone the Jews had any conception of the kind of person Jesus was until the resurrection. Are we not justified in saying that this statement of Schlier is based on the tragic sufferings of the Jews in history and could serve as a basis for all kinds of anti-Jewish views which are content to let the Jews continue as a wandering people? We are grateful to Sister Klein for drawing our attention to these types of interpretation whether in German or French writings.

The Reformation had as its central truth that a man was justified by faith and not by works of the law. It took hold of Paul's sharp antithesis of 'faith-works' and developed all its implications. Thus the legalistic scheme of righteousness built upon a man's achievement was done away and the law was caught up into the law of Christ. This line of thought is developed by a number of theologians who tend to make the whole of Judaism tied in to legalism and the whole of Christianity set in the context of grace. The antithesis is, however, too sharp. Many good Jews are aware that the fulfilment of the law is only possible with Divine help. Many Christians replace grace by achievement with a centralisation on man as the master of his own destiny both in the past as well as in the present. Sister Klein insists that while the law might be caught up into the law of Christ, this is true for the Christian. It is not true for the Jew, who continues as part of Judaism. For him the 'Torah' is the way of life. Criticism is justly levelled at those who lean on the Greek term 'nomos' and ignore the Hebrew term 'Torah' which it translates. The 'Torah'



includes within its significance much more than 'law'. It can mean e.g., instruction, path, God's word and call to Israel as part of his covenant (p.39). Sister Klein claims that many writers, in their discussion of 'law', show their anti-judaistic tendencies in isolation from the Judaism of today. They ignore often the reality of the continued existence of Judaism, living in conformity to the Torah.

There can be no doubt of the justice of many of the strictures of Sister Klein. Even if at times she is somewhat hasty, perhaps not sufficiently aware of how acute the problems of NT interpretation are, perhaps too ready at times to find what she wants to find, nevertheless she has made her case and often in convincing fashion. Not all the names she cites link up with anti-Judaism, indeed quite the opposite. To have notable writings placed in a context of suggested anti-Judaism, gives quite an interesting and unusual slant to what they say. The drift of German and French scholarship in an anti-Jewish direction is underlined by a consideration of the views of some British and American scholars whose approach is strikingly different (pp.143- 156).

We congratulate Sister Klein on a courageous, provocative and sobering piece of writing which no one especially in the field of Jewish-Christian relations should fail to read.

E.A.R.

J.D.G.Dunn:

Unity and Diversity in the New Testament

SCM, 1977 pp 1-xvii, 470 £12.50

No one can doubt the fact that there is a variety of emphasis in the NT writings, perhaps to be explained by the situation addressed, or by the aspects of theology which appeal most to the writer involved, or for some other reason. Whether this variety is to be pushed to the point of opposition within the NT writings is a matter on which scholars differ, e.g., does James by his emphasis on 'works' really stand in conflict with Paul or does Jesus (or Matthew) oppose a point of view like that of Paul on 'law'? ; are there different understandings of the meaning of the Cross of Christ (Paul and Luke) or is it merely a matter to do with the approach of the writer ( does Luke, for example, simplify

his writing for the Graeco-Roman world to such an extent that he can be said to have no theology of the Cross??)

In this book by Dr James Dunn, we have an attempt to grapple with the problem of this diversity. It is the third major work to come from his hand in the space of eight years, a remarkable achievement by any standards( the other two are "Baptism in the Holy Spirit"(1970) and "Jesus and the Spirit" (1975)). The book represents lectures delivered to degree students of Nottingham University and is offered as a "kind of introduction to the NT".( p.xii). A considerable area is covered, including 'kerygma' in the NT ( some may find Dr. Dunn's use of the plural 'kerygmata' strange as the plural 'Gospels' could well be ), confessional formulae, tradition, use of the OT, ministry, worship, sacraments, Spirit and experience; Jewish, Hellenistic and Apocalyptic Christianity; early Catholicism and, finally, a provocative chapter on the authority of the NT. In addition, a formidable array of names is offered in the bibliography (some 438) and in the index (338). It is interesting to note the names which occur most frequently in the index, e.g., Käsemann (47), Jeremias (18), Bultmann (17), Barrett (16)(references to Dr Dunn's own writings amount to 40). There are however surprising omissions: in a book which dismisses infant baptism in one page (160-161), no mention is made of two important works on infant baptism by Jeremias; in the contrast( or opposition) of 'faith' and 'works' in James, no mention is made of the useful discussion of Franz Müssner in his commentary on the epistle( pp 251-2).

The title, "Unity and Diversity in the NT", reflects what must have been an important turning-point in the thought of Dr Dunn. He took part in a study group which concentrated on questions raised by Walther Bauer's book, "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity"(ET, 1971). Here early Christianity was seen to be a mixed bag, indeed there was said to be no uniform concept of orthodoxy in the NT(p.3). The opening chapter asks whether orthodoxy was a meaningful concept in the NT period. The concept of 'diversity' or 'opposed elements' within the NT is illustrated by the writings of a number of German radical scholars. These include, besides Bauer, F.C.Baur with his undue emphasis on the contrast of Petrine and Pauline elements in the NT; Bultmann with his insistence that it is 'faith' and not 'orthodoxy' which distinguished Christianity from the religion of the Jews or of the heathen; and Käsemann ( who, like Bultmann, sees Gnostic influence in the Fourth Gospel) who discerns a naive

docetism in the Fourth Gospel bound up with its Gnostic origins, and of 3 John as the writing of a Christian Gnostic who is attacking the orthodox Diotrephes- a reversal of the usual understanding.

It is interesting that the only scholar mentioned who champions an orthodoxy in the NT is a British scholar, H.E.W. Turner (p.5). At times the anxiety to show the diversity or opposition within the NT puts too great a strain on the argument, e.g., the doubtful argument re 'kerygma' as content or act of preaching (p.11f); the 'either-or', typical of Johannine theology, is not entirely absent from the Synoptic Gospels though the dualism in the former serves to bring out the contrast more compellingly (p.28); Jesus was not the only teacher to radicalize the claim of God in the Sermon on the Mount- such teaching was to be found in the best Jewish thought (p.16)

Perhaps a more striking illustration is to be found in the paragraph on "The Kerygma in Acts" (pp.16-21). Here we find Acts treated separately from Luke- a dubious method. We are told that the writer of Acts shows hardly any concern for the historic Jesus but does he not presuppose his Gospel has been read already? Are we to apply the same reasoning to miracle in Acts- it appears to be bound up often with faith- that we apply to what Jesus said to his opponents in the Gospels? Again the suggestion of the absence of an ethical corollary to the preaching ignores the teaching of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke; if 'love' does not occur in Acts, what about Luke? It would appear that in the concern to draw out the diversity, the unity of Luke and Acts as a twofold work dedicated to Theophilus is not taken sufficiently into consideration. Acts can hardly be effectively considered in isolation from the Gospel of Luke.

It is clearly impossible to cover all the points that might be discussed in this detailed and compressed book. It pursues an interesting and, at times, provocative line and should prove a valuable basis for seminar and tutorial groups, if only to sift at depth the views expressed. The approach attempts to be fresh and stimulating and succeeds in large measure. The proliferation of italics can be distracting at times, e.g., on p.157 we have no less than three sets of three line italics; by p.184 some 125 sets of italics were counted.

In the final chapter on the authority of the NT, Dr Dunn faces up to the problem of a Canon of the NT.



He recognizes that some at least of the NT writings were not written by apostles and that the writings cannot be explained in terms of the traditional view of 'apostolicity'. He maintains that all the apostles did not preach the same message and disagreed strongly on several points. Not all, however, will be convinced that there is a strong disagreement and some at least have not been able to reach the position of Dr Dunn where he denies that the NT writings are more inspired than other and later Christian writings, and would place Luther or Charles Wesley in the same category of inspiration as a NT book. At least some kind of decision is reached on what must always be a controversial issue—the nature of the canonicity of the NT and some kind of attempt at definition(p.387f )

A number of errors in the text have been noticed: 'apparrant' should be 'apparent'( p.29, line 14 top); 'embarassment' should be 'embarrassment'( p.44, line 7 top); no beginning to the second paragraph on p.115, '...organisation is....'.

E.A.R.

Ray S.Anderson:  
(Edit.)

Theological Foundations for Ministry

T.& T.Clark, Wm Eerdmans  
pp xii, 776 no price given

The sub-title of this book clearly indicates both its nature and intention, "Selected Readings for Theology of the Church in Ministry." Its nature is that of selections from the writings of well-known theologians particularly those of Karl Barth and T.F.Torrance, but with others like H.Thielicke, Hans Küng, Dietrich Bonhoeffer figuring prominently. Its intention is to give a solid theological interpretation of the basis of the total ministry of the Church. In this it is eminently successful and avoids limiting itself simply to the areas commonly discussed in work on ministry, most notably the doctrine of apostolic succession.

The book is very large indeed but is divided into four sections with a helpful introduction to each by the editor. All the writings have already appeared elsewhere.

The first section discusses the question of the basis of ministry in God's acts of reconciliation as a divine-human act. Karl Barth enquires into and expounds

the need for and the nature of theology as an interpretation of the revelation attested in Scripture. Theology based on the Word and guided by the Spirit is itself a ministry and enables the church to see all other ministry in its true light. Thieliicke follows this by developing a doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the starting point for evangelical theology and argues that it is the Word illumined by the Spirit that is the basis for ministry rather than the 'Cartesian Self', our method of knowing and its subjective judgments. T.F.Torrance shows how our theological language as human response is based on the objectivity of divine revelation. In Jesus Christ as the content of that revelation we have both divine grace and human response in one. There is therefore a word within and by the Word - a historical aspect to revelation; the divine revelation by its assumption of the human thus confers rationality upon the creaturely order.

In all these writers an attempt is made to overcome the dichotomy between 'pure theology' and 'applied theology'. This is in fact stating a central theme of Karl Barth that explicatio is at the same time always applicatio.

Section two deals with the Christological foundations for ministry and takes up Barth's splendid treatment of Jesus Christ the Lord as servant in Dogmatic IV, 1. It is precisely in his ministry, going to the depths of the Cross that he proves and maintains his deity, yet he does so in obedience, in service, fulfilling this on the Cross, revealing it in the resurrection and actualizing it by the Holy Spirit.

Torrance takes up this christological theme and shows how the service and ministry of the church is based on Christ's own service to God for the world. Christ risen and exalted acts now in calling and determining the form and pattern of ministry. W.A.Whitehouse points out how contrary Christ's ministry was, and is, to the world's conception. Our ministry, based on Christ's, is not shaped primarily by situational demands and needs but by the divine will and purpose revealed in Jesus Christ. In an interesting chapter the editor speaks of 'Kenotic solidarity', that is, God's solidarity with the world as revealed in Jesus Christ. In all ministry we see the ministry of God in Christ by the Holy Spirit for the world.

Section three deals with the implications of this.

Christ does not work in a vacuum but primarily in and through his community, the church. This community, according to Barth, is called, equipped and ordered for ministry. The church grows as it is quickened, assembled and used by Christ. The editor adds to this in the next chapter the thought that the church is presented as the 'Presence' and the 'Powerlessness' of Christ in the world. In this section there are also three very fine expositions of the nature of worship within the church by Barth, J.B. Torrance, and T.F. Torrance in which it is cogently argued that all worship, like all prayer, is our being caught up into, and sharing in the worship of, the one true intercessor and worshipper, Jesus Christ. Worship is thus a recapitulation of the saving events of the Gospel and the foretaste of God's coming grace and judgment.

No discussion of ministry would, however, be complete without some reference to what is normally called 'The Ministry'. This exposition is carried out in a thorough and distinctive way by T.F. Torrance. There must be 'order' in the church, effecting the new order Christ has brought by his life, death and resurrection. The order is basically that of the church as a whole and Torrance sees each member and the church individually and corporately ministering. The Ministry is a particular calling and task within this context, exercised within, and sharing, the ministry of the people of God as a whole. Torrance does not accept the view that Presbyter and Bishop are distinct offices, though they may be different in function. Ordination is a setting apart of each member and of all to ministry, but is particularly associated with those called, equipped and trained for a special task within the whole. Hans Küng points out in this connection that all ministry has an eschatological and charismatic dimension - by the grace of the Spirit and in the light of the end.

The final lengthy section points to the ministry of the community and introduces three aspects - the incarnational, the kerygmatic and the diaconal. The first is based on God's mission in the church to the world in which Barth shows with clarity and persuasiveness that the church is there, as Christ was, to serve the world with the Gospel. The missionary imperative is native to its being, and without it the former not-



as ecclesiae of preaching and sacraments are a torso. Bonhoeffer makes the same point in his exposition. In this section, too, we have the voice of Ignacio Ellacuria from Latin America arguing for a theology of liberation. This, while well stated, is in sharp contrast to all the other writers and contrary to their theological positions which, while varied, have considerable common basis and approach. Ellacuria's exposition does not fit into the general scheme or pattern of the book and this is implicitly conceded by the editor.

The kerygmatic ministry is again given a solid theological foundation. The content of preaching is more important than the technique, though both are needed. The basis of preaching is the salvation events, the story of God's mighty acts in Christ for our redemption. It is a human word and witness but by the Holy Spirit can become Christ's address in grace and judgment to men.

The last chapter deals with the diaconal ministry. This cannot be limited, according to Barth, to 'service' in the sense of help but must be the attitude and expression of the whole church through each office and function. T.F. Torrance in an excellent essay shows the doctrinal basis of the diaconate in Christ's coming, nature and service. The Lord is the servant of all in incarnation and atonement. Service thus cannot be left to the State but is a necessary aspect of the work of the incarnate Lord. So the church is therapeutic through healing and help, counselling and service.

An epilogue is added by T.F. Torrance to this extremely useful and important book. In this he seeks to relate the foregoing to the present life of the church. He points back to the calling in Christ to mission in its totality, to a sense of everything centred in God's revelation in Christ and the power of the Spirit. He sees ministry as a summons to worship through Christ by means of his true offering as man. He calls for a new openness to God's mind in Christ- his rationality- leading to readiness to obey the creative mind of God.

This is a book based on solid theological foundations, showing the various aspects of ministry in the nature of God's self- revelation in Christ and yet aware at the same time of the contemporary debate and contemporary needs. It is not one to be read as a whole, but one to be used as an invaluable source book for some of the best essays that have been written in recent decades on the theological

foundations for, and the nature of, the ministry.

Union Theological  
College, Belfast.

John Thompson

### Contributors

- Dr James D.G.Dunn: Senior Lecturer in NT Studies,  
University of Nottingham; author  
of "Baptism in the Holy Spirit"  
(1970), "Jesus and the Spirit" (1975)
- Dr David Hill: Reader in NT Studies,  
University of Sheffield; author  
of "The Gospel of Matthew" (1972)  
"Greek words and Hebrew Meanings"  
(1967)
- Revd Martin McNamara: Author of "The NT and the Palestin-  
ian Targum to the Pentateuch" (1978)  
"Targum and NT" (1967); article on  
"Targums" in Supplementary Volume to  
"The Interpreters Dictionary of the  
Bible" (1976)
- Revd Dr R.H.E  
Uprichard: Lecturer in Biblical Studies, Queen'  
University, Belfast; Minister of  
Trinity Presbyterian Church, Ahoghill



## Contributors

Contributions are welcome, preferably in English and should be typed.

It would be helpful if contributors could make use of an electric typewriter and type within the area indicated in any sample full page of the Journal. Worn ribbons produce a poor result in being photographed for lithographic plates. Carbon ribbons in typewriters of the Golf Ball type generally produce excellent results. 'Note' presentation should conform to that presented in the Journal.

All contributions should be sent direct to the  
Editor, at      Union Theological College  
                  Botanic Avenue  
                  Belfast BT7 1JT

---



